DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 194 004 HE 013 216

TITLE Improving Teaching and Institutional Quality. Current Issues in Higher Education, No. 1, 1980.
INSTITUTION American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 80
NOTE 63p.: Papers presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association for Higher Education (Washington, DC, March 1980).
AVAILABLE FROM Publications Department, American Association for Higher Education, Suite 780, One Dupont Circle, Washington, DC 20036 ($3.50)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Accountability; Educational Attitudes; *Educational Counseling; *Educational Quality; *Faculty Development; Faculty Evaluation; *Higher Education; *Instructional Improvement; Research; Student Motivation; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Effectiveness; Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

Six essays are collected on the subject of the quality of institutions and their instruction. In "When Does a College Deserve to be called 'High Quality'," by Alexander W. Astin, various perspectives of quality are outlined and commented upon: the mystical view, reputational view, resources view, outcomes view, and value-added view. Problems with the traditional measures of quality are discussed, and the student-oriented view of quality is encouraged. "Measuring the Quality of Student Effort," by C. Robert Pace, discusses the issue of institutional accountability for that effort and for related student achievement. A commentary by Mark H. Curtis is included. "The Changing Roles and Priorities of Academic Advising," by Toni B. Trombley and David Holmes, provides two general criteria for judging advising programs: how others view the program, and the program's relevance to institutional objectives. "Teaching Improvement Strategies: How Effective Are They?," by Robert J. Menges, focuses on research in five categories of teaching improvement activities: workshops and seminars, grants to support faculty projects, ratings by students, self-observation by microteaching and minicourses, and protocol materials. In "Are Instructional Improvement Programs Off-Target?" by Robert T. Blackburn, Glenn R. Pellino, Alice Boberg, and Colman O'Connell, studies of faculty perceptions of faculty development programs demonstrate that such programs should focus more on professional development needs other than teaching improvement. "What Are the Obstacles to Improving Quality Teaching," by Hans O. Mauksch, outlines positive and negative factors, such as the belief in teaching as an innate talent, the belief in classroom privacy, teaching without training, a minority group mentality, some organizational models of teaching, disciplinary associations, reward systems, evaluation methods, and projects to promote change. (MSE)

ED194004

1980 NO. 1

Current Issues In Higher Education

Improving Teaching And Institutional Quality

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

American Association for Higher Education

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE013216

American Association for Higher Education

AAHE

The American Association for Higher Education is a national organization open to all individuals concerned with the value and effectiveness of higher education. Each year AAHE's National Conference on Higher Education brings together some 2,000 educational administrators, faculty, students, representatives of accrediting and testing agencies and education associations, government and foundation officials, and others, to discuss common concerns, disseminate effective educational practices, and focus on the future of higher education. The theme of the 1980 Conference was "Improving Quality During Hard Times: An Action Agenda."

The papers presented at that meeting form the basis for this publication. These papers were reviewed by a committee of AAHE members and 17 were selected for publication in this series. They have been grouped into six volumes published serially. Each volume focuses on one aspect of the quality improvement problem: improving teaching; the role of two external agencies; declining faculty salaries; new models for general education; the contributions of adult development theory; and national, state, and institutional strategies for retrenchment.

AAHE members receive a subscription to *Current Issues in Higher Education* as part of their membership fee. Copies of individual issues of the series are available from AAHE. See the list on the inside back cover.

Board of Directors 1979-80

President
Martin A. Kramer, former senior fellow, Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education

Vice President (President-Elect)
Martha E. Church, president, Hood College

Past President
Wilbert J. McKeachie, director, Center for Research on Learning and Teaching, The University of Michigan

Members
Alexander W. Astin, professor of higher education, University of California, Los Angeles; president, Higher Education Research Institute, Inc.
Marie Childers, Department of Higher Education, Indiana University
R. Morton Darrow, vice president, Public Affairs, The Prudential Insurance Company of America
Paul A. Elsner, chancellor, Maricopa County Community College District
Arturo Madrid, associate dean and executive officer, College of Liberal Arts, University of Minnesota
Colette Mahoney, RSHM, president, Marymount Manhattan College
Robert F. Sexton, deputy executive director for planning and policy, Kentucky Council on Higher Education
Donald M. Stewart, president, Spelman College
Elizabeth Wells, consultant, Cincinnati, Ohio
Willard Wirtz, chairman of the board, National Institute for Work and Learning

Current Issues in Higher Education
Vol. 2, No. 1
September 3, 1980

Current Issues in Higher Education (ISSN 0070-1971) is published six times a year—weekly from the first week in September through the second week in October—by the American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 780, Washington, D.C. 20036 (202/293-6440). AAHE members receive the publication as part of their membership fee; $9 of the fee covers the subscription cost. Subscription price for nonmembers is $15.

Application to mail at second-class postage rates is pending at Washington, D.C. POSTMASTER: Send address changes to American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 780, Washington, D.C. 20036.

1980 Current Issues in Higher Education No. 1

Improving Teaching And Institutional Quality

page

When Does A College Deserve To Be Called "High Quality?" 1
Alexander W. Astin

Measuring the Quality of Student Effort 10
C. Robert Pace

Commentary—Mark H. Curtis 17

The Changing Roles and Priorities of Academic Advising 20
Toni B. Trombley and David Holmes

Teaching Improvement Strategies: How Effective Are They? 25
Robert J. Menges

Are Instructional Improvement Programs Off-Target? 32
Robert T. Blackburn, Glen Pellino, Alice Boberg, and Colman O'Connell

What Are the Obstacles to Improving Quality Teaching? 49
Hans O. Mauksch

Copyright 1980, American Association for Higher Education

Foreword

The six papers in this monograph focus on new conceptions of institutional quality and ways to improve the education of students. Each of the authors views the teaching role of the faculty member as central to improving institutional quality, but they differ on the steps that ought to be taken to bring about more effective learning.

Alexander W. Astin argues that traditional conceptions of quality rankings of institutions should be revised, and that "quality" be understood as the extent to which an institution increases the learning of its students and faculty. When this is done, one finds the most underdeveloped collegiate resource to be the teaching and advising skills of faculty members, so Astin offers suggestions for improving those skills.

The institution's resources are only one side of the educational quality question, argues C. Robert Pace. Another important factor is how effectively students use these resources. Pace reports on the results of a study of student effort. The results of this research, says commentator Mark Curtis, can be used to modify the ways institutions think about their teaching and extracurricular responsibilities.

Toni B. Trombley and David Holmes describe new developments in behalf of improved academic advising of students. They claim that the advantages good academic advising offers for improved student retention will convince some institutions to boost their advising efforts at a time when other peripheral programs are being eliminated.

Robert J. Menges pulls together the research on various improvement strategies (workshops, grants, student ratings of instruction, microteaching, protocols) and assesses the effectiveness of each of these methods.

All of the previous papers must be judged against the findings of a survey by Robert T. Blackburn and colleagues of 27 faculty development programs. To faculty, improving teaching means improving their knowledge of their own discipline. Hence, faculty rated as the most effective those teaching improvement efforts that focused on helping them keep up-to-date with developments in their field.

Sociologist Hans O. Mauksch ties the package together with a critical examination of the status of the teaching profession. Quality teaching will not be improved by focusing on teaching activities alone, he states. Attention must be given to modifying a social environment that confers little prestige on the teaching portion of a faculty member's role.

When Does A College Deserve To Be Called "High Quality?"

Alexander W. Astin

I would like to share with you some personal views about institutional quality that have grown out of my 20 years of more or less continuous involvement in studies of American higher education. First, I will review what I see as five very different conceptions of quality that have dominated educational research and policy during the past several decades. Second, I will argue that none of these conceptions is really adequate and that all of us concerned with higher education must revise our traditional notions about quality if we are to cope effectively with the problems that will confront us during the next two decades.

To simplify my task and to focus the discussion on a mission that is shared by virtually all institutions of higher education, I have narrowed the scope of my argument to just one of higher education's three basic functions: the education of students. Research and public service—also important functions—are considered only insofar as they relate to an institution's educational function.

Current views of quality

For simplicity I have labeled the five different views of quality as follows: The *mystical* conception, the *reputational* conception, the *resources* conception, the *outcome* conception, and the *value-added* conception. Let us quickly take them up in that order.

The mystical view. Many academics take what I call the "mystical" or "fuzzy-headed" view of quality in higher education: They maintain that quality simply cannot be defined or measured because the activities of institutions are too complex and varied, because different institutions have different objectives, because the outcomes of higher education are too subtle, because methodological problems are insurmountable, and so on. In effect, the mystical conception rejects the idea that valid assessments of quality can be made.

My main objection to this view is that it fails to recognize that judgments about quality in higher education are made every day. And these judgments are not mere intellectual exercises; rather, they form the basis for important life decisions. Students deciding which college or graduate school to attend, prospective professors deciding where to apply for a job, officials of federal agencies or philanthropic foundations deciding where to award grants, and state budget officers deciding how to allocate resources among various institutions within a system—all are making quality assessments. Even within individual institutions,

Alexander W. Astin is professor of Higher Education at the University of California, Los Angeles and president of Higher Education Research Institute, Inc., Los Angeles, California.

trustees and administrators apply their particular judgments about quality when they set admissions policies, establish course and degree requirements, hire faculty and staff, and develop the library and physical plant. In short, the mystical view that quality in higher education cannot be evaluated is simply unrealistic. The real issue is how these assessments are done and whether they can be improved.

The reputational view. Perhaps the most straightforward way to define institutional quality is on the basis of a consensus of opinion. Quality, in these terms, is whatever people *think* it is. If all of us here were to jot down on a piece of paper the 15 most prestigious institutions in the United States, the degree of agreement would be remarkably high, especially considering that we have some 3,000 institutions to choose from. The 15 institutions with the most votes would have highly selective undergraduate admissions, large enrollments, and large graduate faculties. If we were then to jot down the 15 institutions with the highest-quality academic programs for undergraduates, some of the same institutions would be named, but some new ones would also get a lot of votes. The new ones would be much smaller than the ones on the first list and much more selective in their undergraduate admissions than the ones that they replace. As a matter of fact, this second list would correspond very closely to the list that would result from ranking all institutions in terms of their selectivity (i.e., the average academic ability of their entering freshman classes).

These facts demonstrate several important realities about institutional reputations in American higher education:

1. In the folklore of American higher education, there is a small group of institutions that are generally regarded as "the best."
2. This folklore exists in the minds not only of educators but also of highly able students, who manifest their acceptance of the folklore in their choice of institutions.
3. Institutional reputation is strongly related to three operational measures: selectivity, enrollment size, and size of the graduate faculty.
4. Perceived educational or academic *quality*, as opposed to mere reputation, depends primarily on undergraduate selectivity and has little to do with size or emphasis on graduate study.

Institutional reputations—particularly as they relate to selectivity—tend to be remarkably stable over relatively long periods of time. The reasons for this stability may become clearer as we consider the next two types of quality assessments.

The resources view. When educators feel the need to develop operational *measures* of institutional quality, they typically equate quality with an institution's educational resources: bright students, highly trained and prestigious faculty, and affluence. (The three types of resource measures have traditionally provided the principal empirical basis for institutional accreditation as well.)

Faculty training can be assessed in terms of the proportion who have the doctorate, and faculty prestige is usually assessed in terms of publications or, for graduate departments, of each faculty's reputation among peers within a given discipline. Institutional affluence is assessed in a variety of ways: endowments, expenditures per student, physical plant, research funds, library holdings, faculty salaries, student-faculty ratios, and so forth. Student quality, of course, is measured by selectivity, i.e., the average academic ability of the freshman class as measured by scores on college admissions tests. Selectivity, in other words, serves a dual

function in the assessment of institutional quality: It can be viewed as a measure of institutional reputation and as a measure of institutional resources.

Empirical studies of these various resource measures show that they are highly correlated with each other (Astin, 1962; Astin & Henson, 1977; Astin & Holland, 1962). Institutions that are highly selective, in other words, also tend to have large endowments, highly trained and prestigious faculty, high faculty salaries, low student-faculty ratios, and so forth.

No discussion of the resource approach to quality can be complete without some consideration of the role of institutional *size*. I have already indicated that size affects judgments of an institution's reputation but not of the quality of its undergraduate program. Institutional size is, however, strongly related to library size, research funds, physical plant, and perceived faculty quality. Ratings of the quality of faculty, at least at the graduate level, are strongly related to sheer numbers of faculty (Blackburn & Lingenfelter, 1973). While this bias in favor of large size has many possible explanations, I think the most plausible involves methodology: Individual faculty members are asked to rate the quality of faculties in other departments. Since such ratings are highly dependent on the scholarly visibility of these other faculties, the larger the department being rated, the greater the likelihood that the rater will be familiar with the scholarly work of one or more faculty members in that department.

The outcomes view. An increasingly popular approach to assessing quality is to focus on institutional *outcomes*. Proponents of this approach argue that the ultimate test of an institution's quality lies not in its reputation or in its resources but rather in the quality of its *products*. Some of the earliest work using this approach looked at outcomes such as the proportion of an institution's graduates who end up being listed in *Who's Who*, the proportion who win graduate fellowships (Knapp & Greenbaum, 1953), or the proportion who go on to get doctorates (Knapp & Goodrich, 1952). Other outcome measures that have been used from time to time include the persistence rates of an institution's undergraduates and the lifetime earnings of its alumni.

The outcomes approach has a special appeal to educators because most outcome measures, like most resource measures, turn out to be highly related to reputational measures. Thus, institutions with good reputations, selective admissions, large endowments, and highly paid faculty also tend to have low attrition rates and high proportions of alumni who earn doctorates, make good salaries, and get listed in *Who's Who*.

A major difficulty with viewing quality in terms of outcomes, of course, is that outcome measures, by themselves, do not necessarily tell us anything about institutional *impact* or *effectiveness*. A wealth of evidence from longitudinal research (Astin, 1962; Astin & Panos, 1969) shows that most output measures depend more on the quality of students admitted to the institution than on the functioning of the institution or the quality of its program. Indeed, unless such measures are viewed in relation to the students' potential at college entry, they may be misleading indicators of institutional effectiveness or quality.

The value-added view. Thus we come to the final popular conception of quality, which can be termed *institutional impact* or, as economists prefer, *value-added*. My impression is that sympathy for this approach has been growing in recent years. If people are asked for their ideal measure of institutional quality, most educators and policy-makers, if they take the trouble to think about it, will say they favor a value-added approach.

The basic argument underlying the value-added approach is that true quality

resides in the institution's ability to affect its students favorably, to make a positive difference in their intellectual and personal development. The highest-quality institutions, in this view, are those that have the greatest impact—add the most value—to the student's knowledge, personality, and career development.

What's wrong with traditional measures?

I suggest that, in evaluating any conception of quality, two basic questions must be asked: Does it really reflect what we mean by quality? Does using it help to enhance quality in higher education?

Let's apply these criteria to the various conceptions that I have already discussed. The mystical view, of course, satisfies neither criterion, since it denies that valid quality assessments are ever possible. But what of the other views?

The reputational and resource views can be treated together, since, even though they are conceptually different, they result in very similar if not identical rankings of institutions. The resource approach generally assumes that the greater the resources, the better the environment for learning. This is, in effect, a kind of "value-added" argument. While surprisingly little research has been done to test this argument empirically, what evidence exists (Astin, 1968) suggests that the argument has little validity. An equally serious objection is that the reputational and resource approaches severely limit how much "quality" we can have in our system because such resources as bright students and prestigious faculty are finite. Moreover, in a highly competitive and meritocratic society, the distribution of these resources tends to become highly skewed, with just a few colleges and universities at the top, and with the majority of institutions being regarded as mediocre.

Finally—and this is a subtle but very critical point—resource-based conceptions of quality tend to focus institutional energies on the sheer *accumulation* or *acquisition* of resources rather than on the effective *use* of these resources to further the educational development of the student.

I have already touched on the shortcomings of the outcomes approach: Since student outcomes, particularly in the cognitive area, are highly dependent on student inputs (Astin, 1962, 1968; Astin & Panos, 1969), looking just at outcome measures tells us nothing about what the *institution* has contributed. Reliance on outcomes is, in effect, a kind of poor-man's value-added approach that is methodologically suspect.

Now, what about the value-added approach? As some of you know, I have been a strong proponent of this approach for a number of years, but lately I have come to realize that it has some serious limitations, particularly if the ultimate goal is to use quality assessments to *improve* our colleges and universities. The value-added approach requires extensive files of multivariate and longitudinal student data collected from large numbers of students and institutions: thus, it is an extremely time-consuming and expensive method of assessment. While I happen to believe that the time and expense involved are well worth it, the funding agencies have never shown much interest in supporting value-added studies, and what little support there is seems to be on the wane. In addition, multi-institutional value-added studies of the type I have been conducting are difficult for an institution to conduct by itself. I am not arguing here that these studies have not proved useful or that they should not continue. Indeed, they have already changed some of our thinking about such matters as the optimal size of an institution, the value of the residential experience, and the relative merits of four-year versus two-year colleges. My point is, rather, that such studies frequently take a long time to produce useful results and that the results are often so general that they are difficult for individual institutions to apply to their particular problems.

Considering the imminent threats to higher education posed by declining enrollments, accelerating inflation, and the dubious status of education in the list of national priorities. I think we need a new conception of quality that can be applied and acted upon right now.

A new conception of quality

I want to argue for a new approach to quality, an approach that is conceptually simple and yet consistent with what we already know from the value-added evidence, that can be adopted immediately and at relatively little cost, and that offers some reasonable hope of significantly improving the quality of the education offered by our institutions. My hunch is that such an approach would, in the long run, also serve to improve the position of education in the list of national priorities.

My basic proposal is that individual institutions undertake a series of concrete and relatively simple actions that would clearly be intended to improve the quality of the educational experience for students. These actions are, I believe, well within the capacity of any institution and would not require new resources.

As I review the general rationale underlying these proposals and describe each specific action, some of you may wonder, "If these ideas are so good and so easy to carry out, how come we haven't been doing so all along?" While I'm not sure I know the answer to this question, let me offer a possible explanation. Most of us—and this includes faculty as well as administrators—have accepted uncritically the resource conception of quality; that is, we believe that we can improve the quality of our institutions by acquiring more bright students, prestigious faculty, and affluence. And we have put so much energy into competing with each other for these limited resources that we have often ignored what we already know about learning and human development. All that my specific suggestions really involve is the application of some of this neglected knowledge—most of which comes from the field of the psychology of learning or from value-added studies—to current institutional policies and practices, with the ultimate aim of improving the quality of the student's learning experience.

Research on learning has taught us several important principles that apply to almost any situation. For simplicity, I will call these principles "knowledge of results" and "time on task." Basically, a large body of evidence (Bloom, 1974; Gagné, 1974; Kulhavy, 1977; Kulhavy & Yekovich, 1978) shows that students learn best when they have knowledge of the results of their learning efforts and when they invest time and energy in the learning task. Value-added research shows us that the benefits of college are directly proportionate to the student's degree of *involvement* in the educational experience (Astin, 1977). Involvement can be manifested in various ways: how much time students spend on campus, how much they study, how much they participate in extracurricular activities, and so forth. As you can see, "involvement" and "time on task" are conceptually very similar.

My general proposal is that institutions should gear their educational policies to maximize the learner's knowledge of results and time on task. Although I have no direct evidence for this, my hunch is that time on task is most likely to pay off when knowledge of results is adequate and fairly immediate. It may also be that these two phenomena are causally related, that the learner will invest more time on task when knowledge of results is adequate.

Note that I use the term "learner" here rather than "student." My reason for this is that faculty and administrators are also potential learners, in the sense that, with better feedback and more time on task, they can improve their skills, and this will ultimately result in improved student learning.

Now for some specifics. To enhance the quality of feedback for faculty-

learners, I recommend three modest activities which very few institutions currently engage in but which almost any institution can adopt at little or no cost. The first is *institution-wide mandated student ratings of classroom instruction for the instructor's eyes only*. In my view, the way in which student ratings are now used is counterproductive. When ratings of classroom instruction are made public or used in personnel decisions, the teacher is motivated to *manipulate* the ratings rather than to use them as a source of accurate feedback. Thus, their learning value for the teacher is seriously compromised. Moreover, when low ratings are made public, the teacher will be tempted to rationalize the results away rather than to learn from them. If institutions feel that student ratings of teaching must be made public or used in personnel actions, then there is a simple solution: Have two sets of ratings, one for the record and one for the private viewing of the professor.

The second activity I propose for enhancing feedback to classroom teachers is *periodic classroom visitation by faculty colleagues*. The purpose of these visits would be to provide each faculty member with constructive criticism by one or more trusted colleagues. To guarantee the honesty and openness of this feedback and to discourage instructors from merely "performing" for their visiting peers, those who serve as critics for a particular faculty member would not be allowed to participate in personnel actions involving that faculty member.

My last specific suggestion for enhancing feedback concerns the other activity that most often brings faculty into contact with students: academic advising. Here I would recommend *periodic surveys to get student evaluations of academic advising*. The results of these surveys should be aggregated by major field and disseminated to each department, together with institutionwide norms. Depending on the size of the department, it might also be useful to aggregate the results separately for freshmen, sophomores, etc. Faculty would then be asked to discuss the results at departmental meetings. If such ratings were made a regular part of the informational feedback to departments—say on at least an annual basis—departments would then have an empirical basis for determining whether their attempts to improve advising have actually worked.

Similarly, survey feedback could be regularly provided to administrators and other staff who deal with students: persons responsible for registration, orientation, financial aid, housing, food services, parking, social activities, career counseling, extracurricular activities, health services, and job placement. In all likelihood, questions about the quality of these services and questions about the quality of academic advising could be included in the same survey.

In addition to having information on students' subjective perceptions about their educational experiences, one ideally would want to know how much students are actually *learning*. While the problem of measuring cognitive growth is too complex to discuss here, our theories about "time on task" and "involvement" suggest that how students spend their time directly affects how much and what they learn. In a sense, then, one of an institution's most precious resources is the time of its students. Periodically surveying students to learn how they spend their time would be a relatively inexpensive procedure; information on the results of such surveys should probably be included in the regular feedback provided to faculty and administrators.

Now who should take the initiative to implement such proposals? While individual faculty members or even trustees might be able to stir up interest in such an undertaking, I feel the prime responsibility rests with the chief executive or with the principal academic officers. Without their leadership and support, these ideas simply could not be implemented.

In this connection, let us consider how corporate executives depend on

informational feedback. The typical business simply cannot function without appropriate feedback on how well it is accomplishing its objective—maximizing profits. The typical college, on the other hand, somehow manages to scrape along with very little regular feedback relating to its objective—maximizing the student's educational development.

To see how ludicrous this lack of information on student development is, we need only to consider what would happen to a business enterprise that had no information on sales volume or on profits and losses. No corporate executive in his right mind would consider approaching his board of directors unless he first had a clear picture of the company's financial condition. Yet, lacking any systematic information on what students are learning or how they feel about their educational experience, college administrators routinely make recommendations to their trustees for changes in faculty and staff, physical plant, and even academic programs. In such circumstances, it is hard to see how academic administrators can hope to provide meaningful educational leadership.

Elevating the importance of education

In many subtle and sometimes not-so-subtle ways, we academics manage to convey the impression that teaching and learning—the educational process itself—are unimportant, low-level activities. Despite our claims to the contrary, teaching still takes a back seat to research in the reward system of most universities. Even our language here is revealing: We commonly speak of our teaching or advising "load," but I've yet to hear any of my colleagues talk about their "research load."

These attitudes toward the art and profession of teaching have not gone unnoticed by the students who have passed through our institutions over the past two or three decades. Many of our voting citizens, and practically all of our politicians and policy-makers, have been exposed to four or more years of higher education and have almost certainly acquired some of their professors' attitudes about education. It also seems likely that this academic snobbery about education has discouraged many bright undergraduates from pursuing careers in teaching, and many talented graduate students from doing their research on educational problems. In this regard, the increasingly poor academic preparation of high school graduates—a common complaint of many university faculty these days—may be partially our own doing: Could these poorly prepared students in fact be the chickens coming home to roost?

The blunt reality of the 1980's is that most institutions will have to make do with what they already have, whether it be physical facilities or faculty and staff. Thus, if institutions are to continue to advance educationally, they will have to find ways to utilize *existing resources* more effectively.

I have argued for certain changes in institutional policies that would be designed primarily to develop one of the institution's most important resources: its faculty. Are these proposals feasible? Is there any reason to believe that faculty members possess untapped potential as teachers that could be realized through better feedback? I think that there is.

If we look at the typical faculty member's two major functions—teaching and research—we find very different patterns in terms of *developed* potential. From the time they entered graduate school, most faculty have been very carefully trained in research methods as well as screened for their interest in, and ability to do, research. Graduate students who lack research interest or expertise drop out of graduate training. After they complete graduate school, young faculty continue to be provided with critical feedback on the quality of their scholarly efforts,

and this feedback continues throughout the careers of most university faculty. Our education system, in short, is well designed to test and develop the faculty member's skills in research and scholarship.

When we look at teaching, however, we find a very different picture. Only in rare instances do graduate programs offer formal training in this complex art. Once the new doctorate recipient becomes a faculty member, he or she gets very little opportunity or encouragement to test and improve skills.

My main point here is that the pedagogical skills of college faculty may be one of the most *underdeveloped* resources in our institutions of higher learning. Concentrating more of our energies on the development of these skills could prove to be the most productive and self-protective activities that institutions can engage in during the next ten years.

High quality institutions

My view that institutions need to take a more student-oriented approach to administration and planning implies a concept of "quality" that deviates considerably from the traditional definitions. Thus, under this new conception, a "high-quality" institution is one that knows what's happening to its students and one that gives faculty clear-cut opportunities to develop their teaching skills under minimally threatening conditions. Further, the high-quality institution has a system of feedback on student development that enables it to make appropriate adjustments in programs or policies when the need for change or improvement is indicated.

In other words, quality is equated here not with prestige or physical facilities but rather with a continuing *process* of critical self-examination that focuses on the institution's contribution to the student's intellectual and personal development.

References

Astin, A. W. " 'Productivity of Undergraduate Institutions." *Science, 136,* 1962, 129-135.

————. "Undergraduate Achievement and Institutional 'Excellence.' " *Science, 161,* 1968, 661-668.

————. *Four Critical Years.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

————. and Henson, J. W. "New Measures of College Selectivity." *Research in Higher Education, 6,* 1977, 1-9.

————. and Holland, J. L. "The Distribution of 'Wealth' in Higher Education." *College and University, 37,* 1962, 113-125.

————. and Panos, R. J. *The Educational and Vocational Development of College Students.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1969.

Blackburn, R. T. and Lingenfelter, P. E. *Assessing Quality in Doctoral Programs: Criteria and Correlates of Excellence.* Ann Arbor: Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Michigan, 1973. (ED 078 728)

Bloom. B. "Time and Learning." *American Psychologist, 29,* 1974, 682-688.

Gagné, R. M. *The Conditions of Learning* (Third Edition). New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1977.

Knapp, R. H. and Goodrich, H. B., *Origins of American Scientists.* New York: Russell & Russell, 1952.

————. and Greenbau, J. J., *The Younger American Scholar: His Collegiate Origins*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953.

Kulhavy, R. W. "Feedback in Written Instruction." *Review of Educational Research*, 47, 1977, 211-232.

————. and Yekovich, F. R. "Feedback in Instruction." *Encyclopedia of Instructional Development*. San Diego: Naval Personnel Research and Development Center, 1978.

Measuring the Quality of Student Effort

C. Robert Pace

The principal assumption of this paper is that what a student gets out of college depends, at least to some extent, on what he or she puts into it. Our notions of quality or productivity or outcomes all seem to suggest that what does or does not result is dependent upon what the institution does or does not do. My own view is different. Accountability for achievement and related student outcomes must consider both what the institution offers and what the students do with those offerings.

The amount, scope, and quality of this student effort has been the object of my research over the last three years. Let me anticipate the conclusion of this report by telling you now that quality of student effort is a very powerful concept; that never again can we afford to make pronouncements about students' progress toward educational objectives or about college impact without taking quality of effort into account; and that the concept of quality of effort throws into serious question some of the widely believed conclusions about college impact.

All learning and development requires an investment of time and effort by the student. Time is a frequency dimension. Effort is a quality dimension in the sense that some kinds of effort are potentially more educative than others. Making outlines of course material or attempting to explain the subject to another student not only requires more effort but is more educative than merely taking notes or underlining passages in a textbook. Outlining and explaining are higher-level cognitive activities.

It takes more effort, but it is also more educative, to serve on a committee of a student club or organization than merely to attend a meeting. It takes more effort, and is more educative, to search through the library's card catalog for relevant materials than it does merely to take out a reference that has been assigned by an instructor. It takes more effort, and it may be more educative, to discuss a personal problem with a counselor than to discuss it with a roommate. It takes more effort, and may be more educative, to ask an instructor for comments and criticisms on a particular assignment than to merely chat informally with the instructor after class.

Quality of experience and quality of effort are probably different ways of describing a very similar concept. Some experiences surely do have greater potential for enhancing learning and development than others. And for the most part such experiences also require more effort.

We analyzed some of these college experiences to develop quite a simple and straightforward measure of quality of effort. For each of a number of areas we selected activities in which students might engage. These activities ranged from the relatively easy and undemanding to ones requiring greater effort which

C. Robert Pace is professor of Higher Education at the Graduate School of Education, University of California, Los Angeles. This research has been supported by a grant from the Spencer Foundation.

would also have a greater potential for enhancing learning and development. In short, the activities themselves would reflect different levels of quality and effort. They would, in that sense, form a scale or measure along a dimension from low to high quality of effort.

Methodology

We have 14 scales dealing with the concept of quality of student effort. Each of these scales, with two exceptions, consists of a checklist of ten activities. Students are asked simply to indicate about how often they had engaged in each activity during the current school year—"never," "occasionally," "often," or "very often." The responses were scored from one (for "never") to four ("very often"). Since the activities themselves range in difficulty or quality of effort, the only way a student could get a high score on a scale would be to engage in higher quality activities with some frequency. Seven of the scales relate to the use of facilities and seven relate to various personal and interpersonal events or opportunities.

Scales related to use of facilities

1. Library
From: routine, and moderately exploratory use—such as using the card catalog
To: increased amount of independent exploration and focused activity—as browsing in the stacks, developing a bibliography, etc.

2. Classroom (course learning scale)
From: relatively simple cognitive activities—such as taking notes, underlining, etc.
To: higher level cognitive activities—such as efforts to explain, organize, and go beyond assignments

3. Cultural facilities (art, music, theater)
From: talking about and attending
To: efforts toward greater understanding (seeking the views of experts and critics) and personal involvement

4. Science laboratory
From: routine assignments and preparation
To: efforts to improve lab skills, and more independent use of lab facilities

5. Student union
From: casual and informal use—had snacks, met friends, etc.
To: programmatic use—attended events, held meeting, etc.

6. Athletic and recreation facilities
From: generally informal use—exercise, games
To: greater efforts toward improvement and skilled performance

7. Residence units (dormitory, fraternity/sorority)
From: general socializing
To: more personal exchanges—helping, sharing, studying together, working together, working on projects

Scales related to use of opportunities

8. Contacts with faculty
From: routine and casual
To: more serious contacts—such as discussing careers, inviting criticisms, seeking counsel

9. Clubs and organizations
From: awareness of events and organizations
To: attending events, discussing programs, working in organizations

10. Experiences in writing
From: general concern with words, grammar, and revisions
To: seeking criticism of others, greater concern with clarity and style

11. Self-understanding (personal experiences)
From: general curiosity about understanding one's own behavior, and others—talking with friends, etc.
To: more focused and expertly informed sources of self-understanding—as in reading, taking a test, talking with a counselor

12. Student acquaintances
From: making friends with different kinds of people—breadth
To: serious conversations with people who differ from you—depth

13. Topics of conversation
From: personal and interpersonal topics of immediate experience—job, movies, social events
To: intellectual and cultural topics concerning values and social issues

14. Information in conversations
From: conversations in which information about the topic is relatively casual and infrequently introduced
To: conversations that typically have expertise, knowledge, and persuasiveness brought to bear on the topic.

College student experiences

These 14 quality-of-effort measures are part of a more comprehensive questionnaire called College Student Experiences used in a major research study in spring of 1979. The questionnaire includes sections on background information, college environment, and the students' estimates of their gains.

The background section requests first, information about the status of the individual—age, sex, marital status, race, and educational level of parents; and second, information about the individual's college experiences—year in college, housing (dormitory or off-campus), grades, major field, expectations about continuing for an advanced degree, time spent studying, time spent on a job, and proportion of college expenses paid by parents or family. This data permits analysis of how quality of effort may be related to various personal characteristics and to other conditions or aspects of the college experience.

Following the background items are the 14 quality-of-effort scales, along with two questions which in combination provide a simple index of students' satisfaction with college: "How well do you like college?" and "If you could start over again would you go to the same college you are now attending?"

The next section of the questionnaire consists of eight rating scales, each dealing with a different aspect or characteristic of the college environment. The first four scales ask the students to indicate how much emphasis they feel is given at the college to certain aspects of student development: academic, scholarly, and intellectual qualities; esthetic, expressive, and creative qualities; critical, evaluative, and analytical skills; and vocational and occupational competence. For each of the emphases there is a seven-point rating scale, ranging from strong to weak.

Three other rating scales ask students to characterize the personal relationships within the college environment—relationships with other students, with faculty members, and with administrative offices and officials. The seven-point scale for relationships with students ranges from friendly and supportive at one end, to uninvolved and alienated at the other end. The relationships with faculty members range from approachable, helpful, understanding, and encouraging to remote, discouraging, unsympathetic. The relationships with administrative officers and officials range from approachable, helpful, open-minded to rigid, resistant, bound by regulations.

One final scale rates the general style of operation as an organization, i.e., college policies, procedures, rules and regulations, and so forth. One end of that scale describes the operation as flexible, open, adaptive, and considerate; at the other end is remote, difficult, impersonal, discouraging.

The final section of the questionnaire, called "estimate of gains," consists of 18 statements of fairly typical and important objectives, such as vocational training, a broad general education, writing clearly and effectively, ability to think analytically and logically, and so forth. The students are asked to what extent they feel they have made progress in college in each of the areas—"very little," "some," "quite a bit," or "very much." These self-reported gains can be regarded as an indication of the extent to which students believe they are achieving important objectives of college education; and one can then determine the extent to which high-quality effort contributes to high attainment or progress toward related goals.

In the spring of 1979 this questionnaire was administered at 13 colleges and universities: three research universities—University of California at Los Angeles, University of California at Irvine, and Indiana University; three of the California State Universities and Colleges—Fresno, Long Beach, and Northridge; two community colleges in the Los Angeles area—Los Angeles City College and Pierce Community College; and five liberal arts colleges—Amherst, Macalester, Occidental, St. Olaf, and Mercyhurst. A total of 4,351 questionnaires were filled out by a cross-section of undergraduates at these institutions, the response rate varying from more than two-thirds in a few places to slightly less than 40 percent in a few others.

The 14 quality-of-effort scales can be grouped into three clusters: the first of these is quality of effort with respect to academic and intellectual experiences and consists of responses regarding the library, the faculty, the classroom, and writing. A second cluster, called personal/interpersonal experiences, includes the scales concerned with self-understanding, student acquaintances, conversation topics, and conversation level. The third cluster relates to group facilities and opportunities—use of the student union and athletic facilities, involvement in clubs and organizations, and in the residence hall or fraternity/sorority. Each of these three composites consists of a large reliable measure of a general distinguishable category of student effort.

Two quality-of-effort scales did not fall neatly into one of those three clusters. One was the scale related to the use of cultural facilities in art, music, and theater where there was a positive correlation wth all three of the larger clusters but not a dominant correlation wtih any one of them. The other related to use of the science laboratory where the correlations with the three general clusters were all quite low.

Given these three main categories of student effort, plus the smaller ones, what can we say about who or what is related to high and low-quality of effort?

With respect to the quality of effort related to academic and intellectual experiences one would hope that this might increase from freshman to senior year.

It does, at least by inference. The mean scores of sophomores are higher than those of freshmen, juniors are higher than sophomores, seniors highest.

One would also, I assume, hope that students who spent a greater amount and quality of effort in academic and intellectual matters would find that it paid off in better grades. And indeed, the quality of effort scores of students whose grades are B— or lower are not as good as those whose grades are approximately B; nor are they as good as those whose grades are B+ or higher. In other words, the higher the quality of academic/intellectual effort, the higher the grade.

The same trend is clearly evident with respect to the number of hours students indicate they spend on academic matters. Students with the highest scores on the academic/intellectual quality-of-effort scales are ones who typically spend 40 hours or more on their school work. Those who average fewer have lower quality-of-effort scores.

The relationships differ with other quality-of-effort measures. For example, there is no particular relationship between year in college and students' quality of use of group facilities and opportunities. Although the freshman year has the lowest mean score, the other three years do not reflect a consistent upward progression. The same is true with respect to the quality of personal and interpersonal experiences. Again, the freshman year is the lowest; and the other three years are all higher but not in a consistent upward progression.

With respect to grades, there seems to be relatively little relationship between quality of effort in using group facilities and opportunities and grades, or in the quality of personal and interpersonal experiences and grades. There is, however, with respect to hours spent on academic work, a consistent upward progression of mean scores with respect to quality-of-effort in using group facilities and opportunities and in personal/interpersonal experiences. In other words, the more time you spend on academic matters, the higher quality of effort you also are likely to exert in using the facilities and other opportunities that are available.

Whether students live on or off the campus is also definitely related to the quality of effort in using a variety of campus-based opportunities. In fact, on all of the quality-of-effort scales it is clearly better to live in college housing than to live at home with parents.

With regard to race or ethnic background, our results show that there are no large differences in quality of effort scores between whites and minority group members—blacks and hispanics.

We can now look at some of these same background and experience characteristics in relation to the extent to which students believe they have gained or made progress toward important educational outcomes. The 18 statements of educational goals can be clustered into four major categories of outcomes.

1. Academic and intellectual outcomes: acquiring background and specialization for further education in some professional, scientific, or scholarly field; ability to think analytically and logically, ability to put ideas together, to see relationships, similarities, and differences between ideas; and ability to learn on your own, pursue ideas and find information you need.

2. General education: gaining a broad general education about different fields of knowledge; developing an understanding and enjoyment of art, music, and drama; broadening acquaintance with and enjoyment of literature; writing clearly and effectively; and becoming aware of different philosophies, cultures, and ways of life.

3. Personal and interpersonal understanding: developing personal values and ethical standards; understanding oneself—abilities, interests and personality; understanding other people and the ability to get along with different kinds of people; ability to function as a team member; and developing good health habits and physical fitness.

4. Understanding science: understanding the nature of science and experimentation; understanding scientific and technical developments and their applications in the society; and quantitative thinking—understanding probabilities, proportions, and so forth.

In relation to these four types of outcomes, we find that there is a general increase in sense of progress from freshman to senior year with respect to all four types of outcomes. Also a higher sense of progress is expressed by people who live on-campus as opposed to those who live at home.

With respect to the outcomes related to general education and intellectual competencies, there is a clear progression that is related to the students' grades. This is not the case with respect to the objectives related to personal and interpersonal understanding, where there seems to be no relationship to the students' grades.

With respect to racial and ethnic characteristics, there are almost no differences of any magnitude in any of the four main outcome categories.

As to time spent on schoolwork, the more time the better with respect to all four of the outcome measures.

In relation to various background and experience factors, then, we know that quality of effort in academic and intellectual experiences apparently increases from freshman to senior year, that quality of effort in those academic experiences also seems to be related to obtaining higher grades and to spending more time on academic work.

The diagnostic value of measuring quality of academic effort can be illustrated by the following: It is true that sheer time spent on academic work is related to progress toward objectives related to general education, to intellectual competencies, and to grades; but it is not the whole truth. The whole truth is that students who spend a lot of time (40 to 50 hours a week) at a low level of quality make less progress toward these objectives than students who spend half as much time (20 hours or less) at a high level of quality; and students who spend 30 hours of high-quality effort get better grades than students who spend 40 to 50 hours of low-quality effort.

We computed all the possible correlations among our measures of effort, environment, and outcomes. Some of the major relationships between effort and attainment are as follows:

1. The quality of effort students make in capitalizing on the personal/interpersonal opportunities in the college experience correlates .44 with reported progress toward the objectives of personal and interpersonal understanding. But it also correlates nearly as high, .40, with progress toward general education outcomes, and .32 with progress in the development of intellectual competencies.

2. The quality of effort students put into using the group facilities and opportunities on the campus correlates .37 with the objectives related to personal and interpersonal understanding; but it also correlates positively with general education outcomes, .28, and with intellectual competency outcomes, .19.

3. The quality of effort that students put into the academic/intellectual aspects of the college experience correlates .39 with intellectual competency

outcomes and .39 with general education outcomes. But it also correlates .29 with outcomes related to personal and interpersonal understanding.

These relationships suggest a basic wholeness about the college experience. Personal and social experiences contribute to intellectual competencies and to general education; academic and intellectual experiences contribute to personal and social development and understanding.

The special or added value of measuring quality of effort can be demonstrated by showing how well outcomes are predicted with it and without it. Given all the information in the questionnaire about student characteristics, and about their status or record in college, and about the college environment, what magnitude of multiple correlation does that produce with each of the four main outcome measures? Then, how much does this multiple correlation increase when the quality of effort scores are added to the equation? The answer is that in every case the multiple correlation with the criterion increased substantially. For the objectives related to personal/interpersonal understanding we reached a multiple correlation of .49 with all the customary variables, but when we added the quality of effort scores the correlation increased to .62. For the intellectual competencies outcomes the multiple correlation increased from .55 to .63 after adding quality of effort. For the general education objectives the increase was from .55 to .66. And for the science understanding objectives the increase was from .60 to .68.

One statement included in our survey was: "If students expect to benefit from what this college or university has to offer they have to take the initiative." Ninety-six percent of the students agreed. They are right. The results of our study show that quality of effort is clearly related to degree of attainment—the greater the effort, the greater the gain. Moreover, quality of effort is the most influential single variable in accounting for students' attainment, and that after all other influences have been added together, quality of effort still makes a substantial additional contribution.

So it turns out that the most influential variable is one that has not previously been included in studies of higher education. Now that it can be included, we shall see whether new research confirms the conclusion I would draw from the data reported here, a conclusion somewhat at variance with prior research. But simply, the conclusion is this: What counts most is not who you are or where you are but what you do.

When we talk about institutional quality, and costs, and accountability we need to remember that there is another sort of quality, one that doesn't appear in the budget but that is nonetheless priceless, and one that contributes mightily to the quality of education, and that is the quality of effort students themselves invest in using the facilities and opportunities in front of them.

Commentary

Mark H. Curtis

I agreed to comment on Dr. Pace's paper not because I am a scholar working in fields allied to his. I am not; I am a historian. As a historian, I might have offered comments arising from Toynbee's observation that creative civilizations were those which contained persons capable of rendering efforts of high quality—efforts that made a difference—in response to critical challenges. But because I am now a user of educational research, who has found Pace's ingenious work valuable, I shall restrict my comments to reflections on how his work assists us in understanding the process of education and guides us in developing policies for higher education. Therefore, I shall not engage in a critique of his methodology or the adequacy and reliability of his correlations. Rather I shall make some suggestions about the significance of his findings, speculate a bit about new departures in pedagogy that they may encourage, and raise an issue or two that could prompt supplemental research.

My first comment is an obvious one. Pace's inquiry into "quality of effort" has much in common with many ingenious and creative developments in research and scholarship. It comes from a fresh and imaginative approach to a topic that has been under everyone's nose but that has been overlooked and neglected. There are few among us who have not said of one or another of our students: He or she "is intelligent but does not put forth the effort needed for high achievement." We have instinctively agreed with the 96% of Pace's sample of college students who endorsed the proposition: "If students expect to benefit from what this college or university has to offer, they have to take the initiative."

Given such intuitive recognition of the importance of quality of effort, why has it taken so long to give this criterion serious study and to develop a procedure to measure and analyze it? Questions such as this intrigue me. Have we not only intuited this factor but taken it for granted? Have we not assumed that everyone applying for and admitted to college would put forth, when challenged, an acceptable quality of effort? Is it a factor that did not become of critical importance until a rising proportion of young people attended college and a considerable number of them experienced disappointment and frustration that could not be explained fully by other means? In other words, has the recent growth of "consumerism," with its complaints and criticisms of colleges and universities, forced a comprehensive search for all factors affecting educational outcomes and made us take seriously what had been taken for granted because other factors did not sufficiently account for the levels of academic attainment achieved by various students?

I suspect, indeed, that our approach to mass higher education has made it apparent that we no longer could take for granted that everyone admitted to college would exert a roughly equal and acceptable quality of effort. In fact, without the benefit of Pace's quality-of-effort scales and scores, many colleges in the late 60's and early 70's introduced pre-freshman-year sessions of a month to six weeks primarily to help certain students—most of whom were the first in their

Mark H. Curtis is president of the Association of American Colleges.

families to attend college—realize that certain kinds of effort would be more productive than others.

When I was a president of one of the Claremont Colleges and observed the beginning of these pre-freshman summer sessions, I saw that they were not intended to be a crash program in remedial English or mathematics, but a systematic and on the whole successful attempt to make students aware of the quality of effort required for academic achievement in college. They provided guidance on how to prepare an outline, familiarized students with the amount and kinds of work required to write a term paper, instructed them on how to mine the material they needed out of the library collections, and gave them practical advice on how to overcome their awe of cultivate helpful relations with the faculty. Begun by upper-class minority students for incoming minority students, they are, I am told, still maintained as opportunities for all students who may have the need for them.

Reflections on what was done before Pace produced his quality-of-effort scales spur me to speculate on what use can be made of his instrument to improve the quality of educational outcomes and not merely to add to our research findings. Take, for example, his finding that "on all of the quality-of-effort scales it is clearly better to live in college housing than it is to live at home with parents." What does this tell us about the most desirable public policy for higher education? Have we been wise to build so many campuses according to plans that encourage students to be commuters? It might be said that we had no choice in the past. The need to provide basic opportunities for higher education was so great that we had to cut corners and the most practical policy was to build educational facilities and forego dormitories. But in the next decade, as demographic changes bring an end to that pressure, might it not be wise to convert commuting campuses into residential campuses as much as possible? Given Pace's findings, would not such a move enhance not only quality of effort but quality of education? Would it not be a good investment?

Or to approach the matter from a different angle, if it is impractical to convert all commuting campuses into residential campuses, how can the conditions that improve quality of effort for residential students be provided in some measure for commuting students? Here we may need some further research. Pace reports what his scales demonstrate concerning the differences in quality of effort but we do not at this stage have an explanation of why those differences exist. What are the conditions or circumstances that account for them? Can those conditions be created for commuting students? Are we dealing here with a matter of physical conditions or is it a matter of attitude? If it is at least in part the latter, how can the attitude of commuting students be modified to enhance their performance and the quality of their effort?

To me, these are significant issues in both educational and public policy that are brought from darkness into light by this research. To put the question as bluntly as it seems to deserve, is it enough to provide classrooms, laboratories, and libraries—the bare essentials for programs in higher education—without the other environmental and social factors that make their use fully productive in attaining the ends for which they are intended?

Finally, Pace's report raises one other question in my mind. Unless I have misinterpreted his study, he has administered his quality-of-effort scales chiefly to full-time students. In the next decade, we may—indeed probably will—be teaching a growing number of part-time, non-traditional students in programs of continuing education. I would like to know what the quality-of-effort scales could tell us about their learning experiences and how these can be improved.

Underlying all my remarks is an assumption that should be made explicit.

I am assuming that "quality of effort" is something that is only in part *sui generis*. To be sure, a student must have the motivation and other traits of character that call forth effort. But taking those for granted, cannot the quality of effort be affected by the learning process? Is it not something to which teachers must give attention and which they must strive to nurture? Obviously, my assumption requires that these questions be answered in the affirmative. If so, I shall go one step further and say that Pace's research demands that faculty concerned with the highest possible educational attainments of their students should consciously recognize the importance of quality of effort and so teach that they stimulate and elicit high quality of effort from their students.

It would appear in these last statements that I have dissented from Pace's position that professors do not "produce learning" and that what a student gets out of college depends, at least to some extent, on what he or she puts into it. I do not mean that at all. I am firmly convinced that significant learning in colleges and universities is an active, not a passive process. What I am saying is that even when dealing with this most personal and subjective matter of such fundamental importance to successful educational outcomes, professors have a responsibility and can use such research as this study to help them meet it.

My concluding remarks can be brief: Pace has provided us with an ingenious means to examine a key factor in the learning experience. His work challenges us to exercise ingenuity equal to his own. The existence of this instrument challenges us to use it in improving the quality of our institutional and public policies. It even challenges us as faculty to find ways that we can enhance the quality of educational opportunites we offer our students.

The Changing Roles and Priorities of Academic Advising

Toni B. Trombley and David Holmes

Academic advising involves providing educationally-related information and guidance to students confronted with choices and alternative paths in their education. Yet the way colleges and universties have conducted this advising has long been criticized by students, faculty, and administrators. Although virtually every institution is pledged to providing personal attention and guidance to each student, many faculty feel beleaguered by its demands, students complain about advising inadequacies, and administrators disagree over who has responsibility for advising tasks.[1] Even where some aspects of an advising program are working quite effectively the criticism persists. For a variety of reasons, most colleges have not yet developed approaches to academic advising that work to the satisfaction of all interested parties. What are the problems with academic advising? Our analysis suggests three major obstacles to good advising systems.

Obstacles to good advising

First, in most institutions academic advising is an activity of low status. Few institutions make a public commitment to advising or identify high-level leadership to promote advising programs. On most campuses, the largest group of advisors, the faculty, receive no special rewards for a commitment to advising or for superior performance in this area. Administrators and faculty often do not agree on how much weight to give to the evaluation of advising in the review of academic programs or to the evaluation of advisors in a faculty reward system.

A second obstacle is a lack of coordination among the various offices and people that perform advising functions. Many staff, including faculty, counselors, academic administrators, student affairs personnel, even clerical staff, have special responsibilities and aptitudes for meeting the personal needs of students. Few institutions have integrated programatically or organizationally the various resources into a coherent campus-wide advising system. The unfortunate results are frequent internecine battles over who controls what and major obstacles to implementing an effective advising system.

A third obstacle to good advising is that the majorty of faculty lack the necessary range of skills and knowledge to be excellent advisors. They do not have easily available opportunities to develop those capabilities and, perhaps most importantly, they are not motivated to improve. Advising, like teaching, is a personal interaction requiring both knowledge and communication skills.

Toni B. Trombley is president of the National Academic Advising Association and director of the Academic Referral Center at the University of Vermont. David Holmes directs the Instructional Development Center at the University of Vermont.

Although many campuses have developed teaching improvement programs in recent years, advising has not received equal attention. The result is that the richest source of advisors on most campuses remains a relatively under-developed resource.

Advising's low status, confused organizational arrangements, and lack of trained personnel emphasize the marginal position of academic advising in contemporary higher education. This is not surprising, but it is important to recognize, especially as institutions set out to improve educational quality at a time of shrinking resources.

Is it reasonable to expect that the status of academic advising will be elevated and that the quality of advising will improve during the 1980's? The conventional wisdom holds that marginal activities and programs will be the first to suffer as the competition for resources intensifies and the political atmosphere heats up. However, our analysis contradicts this conventional wisdom. We predict that institutions will commit themselves to strengthening their academic advising system as one of the best investments they can make during the 1980's.

Harbingers of change

A major step toward elevating the importance of advising was begun in October 1977. The first National Conference on Academic Advising was held in Burlington, Vermont, and drew 275 participants from around the country. Subsequent annual conferences attracted increasing numbers and, as an outgrowth of these conferences, the National Academic Advising Association was incorporated in 1979. Membership in the association reached 500 in less than a year.

At the same time, complementary efforts have helped to bring academic advising to wider awareness. The American College Testing Program conducted a national survey of academic advising practices.[2] Responses were received from 820 institutions. Findings indicate that the renewed interest in the quality of advising services has not been translated into clear practices and statements of policy. The Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development in Higher Education at Kansas State University introduced a standardized advising evaluation form for national use,[3] and many institutions have developed their own instruments to assess the quality of advisors and advising. For the first time, there is a growing community of researchers, practitioners, and policy-makers who are in regular contact and communication. An important aspect of those developments is that academic vice presidents and presidents have participated extensively. There are indications that institutional leaders are recognizing the importance of academic advising and are seeking avenues for improving performance. These new national resources will be important for building viable academic advising systems. Unfortunately, there is evidence that the development of advising on individual campuses hasn't matched progress at the national level—this is the next stage for the advising movement.

What are some developments in higher education that are likely to have a direct impact on the future of academic advising? The first is that many campuses will see a decline in the numbers of traditional college-age students during the 1980's. The National Center for Education Statistics estimates peak enrollments to occur in fall 1981, with enrollment in 1988 at four percent below the nearly 12 million projected for 1981.[4]

The second is that student bodies will change significantly. The Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education predicts that by the year 2000 there will be "radical changes" in the composition of the student body. This will

bring on the "Golden Age of the Students" who will be recruited, supported, counseled, and admitted more aggressively. One-fourth of these students will be minorities, one-half or more will be women, one-half will be over 21, and equally significant, there will be as many part-time as full-time students. Institutions that continue to attract essentially the same composition of students as in the 60's and 70's will, they warn, find half of their classrooms empty.[5]

The Carnegie Council sees indications that institutions will indeed face threats to their survival and that many will, instinctively: change admissions requirements; place increased emphasis on the retention of students; and search for non-traditional students, who in the past have been least preferred.[6] A critical question, however, will be whether institutions assume a psychology of decline and of survival-at-all-costs, or whether they take on a psychology of calculated change, improvement, and commitment to the education of the students they admit.

Retention and advising

On the basis of this research, we believe that as institutions take necessary steps toward guaranteeing their own survival, student retention and academic advising will become more important. The healthy institution will place the highest value on meeting the diverse needs of each of its students. This stance will enhance prospects for survival. This stance will also elevate the importance of good academic advising.

Reports on retention by Noel, Pantages and Creedon, Pascarella and Terenzini, and others leave little doubt that the academic advising system plays a major role in the student's process of identification and perception of 'fit' with the institution.[7] Feldman and Newcomb, Astin, and others have demonstrated the positive relationship between student satisfaction and good interactions between faculty and students.[8]

An important aspect of the student's development and growth lies in making personally satisfying decisions. To do so, each student needs the opportunity to take personal risks and to retain an element of control over the development of his or her academic program. In general, students give serious consideration to alternative ways to earn credit, part-time programs, individually-designed majors, transfer, stopping out, unique subject-matter concentrations, double majors, and multiple degrees. When presented the opportunity and guidance through an academic advising system to shape features of their own academic lives, they find their personal relationship with the institution enhanced and their desire to persist strengthened.

Traditionally, faculty advising functions have consisted of signing registration cards, maintaining student records, and describing the requirements of an academic major. These elements do not demand substantive personal contact between the student and advisor and, in fact, often become an exercise in one-way communication. Advising, as it is defined in the current literature, is a much broader concept. From this broader perspective, advisors must be able to establish and maintain a relationship with advisees that helps them "conceptualize their situation and future possibilities."[9]

Thus, there is persuasive evidence that academic advising, student retention, and institutional stability are strongly linked. This suggests that the future of academic advising is bright and that institutions will elevate its importance. Further, the evidence suggests that obstacles of low status, organizational confusion, and untrained staff can be overcome if we are guided by some essential concepts. First, institutional commitment to advising must be demonstrated in terms of human, fiscal, and physical resources and implemented through a well-articulated

set of principles and guidelines. Second, we must recognize that the components and criteria of an effective advising system can be isolated and that the skills and insights of good advising can be developed. Finally, each institution must appoint one individual or office to coordinate or oversee the total academic advising system. This will help prevent fragmentation between units and will help promote desirable outcomes.

A confounding factor is that in the competitive atmosphere of the 1980's institutions will be forced to choose among alternatives. How will they decide whether and how to modify, expand, contract, initiate, or eliminate programs? The two overriding criteria likely to be used are *quality* and *value*. Quality has been explained, "Questions of quality involve assessment of the extent to which a program achieves its goals, i.e., of its excellence and contributions in its appropriate teaching, research, and service activities."[10] Value has been defined as follows:

> *The theme of value embraces the nature, importance, and responsiveness of a program's goals as they relate to the needs and goals of the university, of students, [of the state], and of the region and nation. The theme of value does not imply intrinsic worth—all programs and all program goals are probably intrinsically worthy—but rather the importance and significance of a program and its goals to the mission of this university at this time.*[11]

Whereas historically the ethos of higher education has included an uncompromising aspiration for quality, the criterion of value has been less stringently enforced. The 1980's will force many hard choices of relative value upon us.

It is crucial that advocates of improved academic advising respond consciously and effectively to these criteria for decision-making in the 1980's. First, the effectiveness and excellence of advising programs must be demonstrated. Good quality is a fundamental, and it must be evident to others. Second, the importance of academic advising to the institution's interests must be argued persuasively and supported by evaluation. In the hierarchy of priorities, it must be demonstrated than an effective academic advising program is essential to institutional survival and to educational quality. In more general terms, what remains critical is institutional action that redirects energies to meet the emerging educational needs of our future students. Academic advising has a crucial role to play in this effort.

Notes

1. Toni B. Trombley, "Academic Advising: Challenge to Universities" (remarks prepared for Third Annual Conference of the National Academic Advising Association, Omaha, Nebraska, October 1979).
2. Donald J. Carstensen and Constance Siberhorn, "A National Survey of Academic Advising: Final Report" (American College Testing Program in cooperation with National Academic Advising Association, October 1979).
3. Howard C. Kramer and Robert E. Gardner, "Advising Survey Form" (Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development in Higher Education, Kansas State University, 1978).
4. Jack Magarrell, "The 1980's: Higher Education's 'Not Me' Decade," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, January 7, 1980, pp. 6-7.
5. Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, *Three Thousand Futures: The Next 20 Years for Higher Education* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980), excerpted in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, January 28, 1980, pp. 9-12.

6. *Ibid.*

7. Ernest T. Pascarella and Patrick T. Terenzini, "Predicting Freshman Persistence and Voluntary Dropout Decisions from a Theoretical Model," *Journal of Higher Education* 51 (1980), 60-75; Lee Noel, "College Student Retention: A Campus-Wide Responsibility," *Journal of the National Association of College Admissions Counselors*, 21 (1976), 33-36; T. J. Pantages and C. F. Creddon, "Studies of College Attrition," *Review of Educational Research*, 48 (1978), 49-101.

8. Kenneth A. Feldman and Theodore M. Newcomb, *The Impact of College on Students* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969); Alexander W. Astin, *Preventing Students from Dropping Out* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975).

9. Toni B. Trombley, "A Self-Study of A Centralized Academic Advising Unit at the University of Vermont," in *Academic Advising: A Resource Document* (1979 supplement), ed. by David S. Crockett (American College Testing Program, 1979).

10. Robert Arns, "Areas of Emphasis for the University of Vermont" (unpublished planning document, University of Vermont, August 1979).

11. *Ibid.*

Teaching Improvement Strategies: How Effective Are They?

Robert J. Menges

Ninety-nine years ago a book on higher education called *Lectures on Teaching* was published in England by Cambridge University Press. In it, F. G. Fitch wrote:

> *The art of teaching is to be learned by practice; it is a matter of experience . . . a man becomes a teacher as he becomes a swimmer not by talking about it but by going into the water and by learning to keep his head above water. . . . The very title doctor which marks the highest academic distinction . . . implies that the holder is qualified to teach the art that he knows. (quoted in McAleese, 1979, p. 108)*

Some decades later the dean of the graduate school of one of our Big Ten universities declared:

> *I take it for grated that every teacher should be interested in teaching, that he should work at the job, and that he should have good common sense. If he does not have those qualities, nothing will make make him a good teacher. If he does have them, he will learn by educating himself. (Payne, 1946, p. 60)*

These statements, and statements like them which are still heard from time to time, reveal a strikingly anti-intellectual view of college teaching. Don't talk or think much about teaching, they imply. Just keep your lungs clear, your arms moving, and your Ph.D. visible. Common sense is adequate for success.

During the last decade, the faculty development movement has countered that view by asserting that college teaching does deserve scrutiny, reflection, and inquiry; that variables important for teaching and learning can be specified and documented; and that teaching can be improved and its impact on students can be enhanced. James Popham, a former president of the American Educational Research Association, contends that appropriate procedures are now available as the result of the work of educational researchers:

> *They have developed a set of procedures which, albeit incomplete, represent a powerful prescription for improving the instructional decisions faced by every college professor. These deal with mechanisms for selecting more defensible course goals, devising instructional sequences that possess a higher probability of success, creating more adequate examinations, etc. (Popham, 1974, p. 11)*

Robert J. Menges is professor and program director of the Center for the Teaching Professions at Northwestern University.

What is the research base for such an assertion? Have programs designed to change the roles and activities of college teachers been shown to be effective? What procedures of demonstrated effectiveness are available to those who plan teaching improvement programs? What strategies might be prescribed to assist faculty in altering their roles, improving their teaching, and enhancing the learning of students? Judy Levinson and I set out to review research on these teaching improvement efforts.

Focus of the review

Before I describe our findings, let me make three comments about the focus of our review. First, we focus on the professor's *teaching* role. Although we recognize that much faculty development effort rightly emphasizes other professional roles (member of an organization, advisor, person, scholar), it is the professor as teacher which concerns us here.

Second, our review is of *research*, not of programs. Unfortunately, few programs have been carefully evaluated and it is only those programs that we discuss here. In our monograph (Levinson and Menges, 1979), we give detailed attention to approximately 60 studies of activities for improving teaching. These activities include workshops for faculty, grants to support professors' instructional projects, feedback to faculty from student ratings of their courses, microteaching, and so on.

Third, we include only those studies with data that go *beyond* the participants' *immediate reactions* of satisfaction or dissatisfaction. A questionnaire completed at the close of, say, a workshop can provide some useful information but can also be quite misleading. It is critical to have data from others—students, classroom observers, faculty development staff—as well as from the participants. Such information is preferably gathered not only at the close of the activity but also after some time has elapsed.

For each of five categories of teaching improvement activities, I shall briefly characterize the nature of the research and the direction of findings. Then I shall discuss a couple of general issues important for teaching improvement programs.

Workshops and seminars

Workshops and seminars are probably the most frequently conducted but least carefully evaluated instructional improvement activity. Their purposes vary greatly: helping faculty get acquainted with one another; examining values about teaching and learning; developing a shared vocabulary for talking about teaching; increasing knowledge about research on teaching; mastering specific skills of communication, examination construction, or specifying course objectives; and so on.

Many of these sessions are aimed at motivating faculty toward teaching improvement, encouraging them to share teaching experiences and philosophies, and other matters of attitude and motivation. Videotapes of college classes, such as the College Classroom Vignettes we have developed at Northwestern University, may serve as stimuli for these discussions. Our research on vignettes shows that they do stimulate involvement in intense discussions and that participants feel the discussions have been effective. Like others who study attitude workshops, however, we have not gathered data about the enduring effects of vignette sessions on participants or their impact on classroom behavior and student perceptions. Research simply does not tell us what impact such motivational activities have beyond the session itself.

On the other hand, there is a body of better controlled research on skill-training programs for college teachers. These studies include participants from a broad range of disciplines but are more likely to involve graduate teaching assistants than faculty. They aim at skills such as clarity of lecturing, involving students in discussion, questioning patterns, and other presumed components of effective teaching. Research comparing trained versus untrained teachers of equivalent experience shows that the benefits of training are discernible to classroom observers, are reflected in student ratings of courses, and (in a few studies) have a positive effect on student learning.

The research is not unanimous, and much of it is methodologically flawed. But it is clear that training *can* be effective. Remember, however, that most of the research participants have been graduate teaching assistants. The impact of similar training on faculty probably depends upon the flexibility (rather than the uniformity) of training activities and on whether or not participation is voluntary. If training is required, it will reach those who need it most but the coercion may produce resistance. On the other hand, flexible and voluntary activities may not meet the conditions required to produce learning. What are these conditions? They include clear training objectives, opportunites for relevant practice, feedback on practice efforts, suggestions for improvement, and then more practice. In addition, if skill gains are to persist, there should be opportunities for delayed practice with feedback after the workshop has concluded. Effective training of this kind demands hard work from faculty, just as effective teaching requires hard work from students, and some faculty resist working hard on their teaching. Consequently, for a good many workshops congeniality seems to be the primary characteristic; they are undemanding and overemphasize rapport. Those workshops may be well received, but they are also likely to be without instructional impact.

Positive effects from workshops are most likely in a climate where improving teaching is acknowledged as requiring effort, where such effort is expected and rewarded, and where workshops are well designed, well conducted, and include follow-up activities beyond the training session itself.

Grants to support faculty projects

Many faculty development agencies, particularly those established with external funding, award small grants competitively to faculty who propose projects for increasing their teaching effectiveness. Grants may purchase needed material or support personnel such as proctors, tutors, and clerical staff. In some programs, released time is given or summer salary is paid. Because of their visibility, grant programs help to create a positive image for professional development centers. Awards also lend credibility to instructional ideas originating in the faculty.

There are numerous published descriptions of such programs but virtually no studies assessing their dynamics or comparing them with other strategies. Not surprisingly, awardees usually express satisfaction with the program in which they participated. Several surveys find that most of the innovations developed with grant support endured beyond the period of the grant. But those innovations are seldom themselves subject to careful evaluation.

Grant programs are expensive primarily because of personnel costs. It may be wise to invest part of those resources in research to identify the characteristics of faculty who use grant funds most effectively, to assess alternative (and less expensive) strategies for accomplishing the same purpose, and to provide awardees with staff help for evaluating their activities. This is not to say grant programs are without value, but we cannot say specifically where their value lies.

Information feedback: instructional ratings by students

Information to faculty about their teaching, based on ratings made by their students, has been hypothesized as sufficient for changing teaching behavior. Most studies on written student feedback are conducted in the following manner. Rating forms are completed by students approximately three to four weeks after the beginning of the term. These ratings are analyzed and, about the fourth or fifth week of the term, results are returned to one group of instructors and withheld from others. Student ratings are again collected at the term's end as a criterion measure. Such studies investigate whether midterm feedback contributes to change in rated teacher performance. In some studies the treatment is information alone; in others personal consultation is provided. In some studies, professors complete the questionnaire as a self-rating against which student ratings may be compared.

Findings with regard to the impact of written feedback alone on subsequent teaching are mixed and many studies are poorly designed. In addition, most participants in this research are volunteers and results may properly be generalized only to volunteers. On balance, evidence is more for than against the usefulness of written feedback, and I see no reason not to use ratings in a systematic way as information about teaching which may lead to the faculty member's improvement.

When consultation is provided, it usually means that someone talked with the teacher, interpreted the written feedback, and perhaps made suggestions for improvement. Research is generally supportive of this strategy, although the precise nature of the consultation is not always clearly described in research reports.

Of course, it may not be feasible to provide consultation to all users of the course evaluation service. Research on instructor-student ratings discrepancies gives a clue on where to begin. The rationale for discrepancy studies is that psychological tension is created for the instructor if there is disagreement between the instructor's and the students' evaluation of instruction. Given this information, the instructor may then change a teaching practice in order to restore the state of equilibrium. These studies yield consistent results: the greatest improvement in teaching comes for those faculty who rate themselves more positively than the students rate them. Consequently, they are the faculty who should have first claim on a consultant's time.

This research gives practical guidance for teaching improvement programs. A properly designed system for student evaluation of courses and teachers can be an agent for instructional improvement, particularly if self-ratings are gathered and if consultation is provided along with written feedback. The greatest impact from this strategy is likely to be for faculty whose self-ratings are higher than their student ratings.

Feedback from practice: microteaching and minicourses

Another source of feedback is self-observation while teaching, as in viewing a videotape of one's class. Videotaping is an important part of the technique called microteaching. Microteaching is a scaled-down teaching encounter in which a brief lesson is taught to only a few students. The lesson is designed to demonstrate particular skills of teaching. It is videotaped, critiqued, and usually retaught and critiqued again. Microteaching has been incorporated into instructional packages, called minicourses, to be used for inservice education of elementary and secondary teachers.

The skill orientation of microteaching, including practice with feedback, is well grounded in behavioral science theory. It embodies most of the conditions for effective learning which I mentioned when describing workshops. Research has demonstrated the value of microteaching in teacher education programs for pre-college teachers and in a small number of studies with college teachers. Findings suggest that microteaching can increase the amount of students' talk in a classroom, develop skills of higher order questioning, and increase the teacher's use of reinforcement.

Minicourses are instructional packages for self-teaching or for use in small groups of experienced teachers. A minicourse user views films of behaviorally defined skills related to effective teaching and practices those skills within a microteaching format. The minicourse allows a working teacher to develop technical skills in a micro setting and eventually to adapt these skills to the regular classroom. Minicourses have benefited from relatively rigorous developmental research and field testing. They appear to be an effective and flexible tool for inservice pre-college teachers but they have not been adapted and evaluated for postsecondary education.

Thus, research at this time is not very helpful regarding microteaching and minicourses for improving college teaching. Microteaching is expensive, intrusive, and at least for some faculty, threatening. Minicourses require considerable research and development for adaptation to postsecondary education. For now the value of microteaching in a faculty development program probably depends on careful assessment of available resources and likely benefits in each situation.

Concept-based practice: protocol materials

Protocols are another contribution from elementary and secondary teacher education. Protocols emphasize concepts basic to effective teaching and therefore represent a concept-based approach rather than the practice-based of microteaching and minicourses.

During protocol training, teachers are provided with written materials and films which describe and illustrate the concepts. They learn to apply the concepts through a sequence of visual illustration, written exercises, and paper and pencil tests. For example, one set of protocol materials has been produced under the title, "Concepts and Patterns in Teacher-Pupil Interaction." Three of the ten films in the series define and illustrate with classroom examples the six concepts basic to the series (productive questioning, reproductive questioning, probing, informing, approving, and disapproving). Six other films show classroom episodes to be analyzed according to the target concept, thus providing practice in interpreting classroom behavior. The final film is used as a performance test; it includes 30 brief scenes to be categorized according to the target concepts.

Persons using protocols are expected to learn the specific concepts, to apply related skills in their classrooms, and to produce more effective learning and more positive attitudes in their students. Note that these effects would be the result of *concept* training, independent of classroom practice. Research on protocols reveals positive effects on teacher knowledge, teacher skills, student perceptions, and student learning. Unfortunately, no comparable research has been done with college teachers.

Since protocol training requires neither videotaping nor classroom practice, it is less threatening and less disruptive of regular teaching than are practice-based programs. Of course, protocol development is expensive, beginning with the identification of concepts critical to instruction. Some of that concept identification

work must be repeated for higher education, since it is by no means clear that existing protocols and the concepts they exemplify are the critical ones for the college classroom. Coordinated efforts to develop protocol materials for higher education may produce handsome dividends. For now, we have only the intriguing suggestion that concept training may be sufficient for improving classroom practice and student impact.

Some general issues

This completes our tour of instructional improvement activities that have been subjected to research. The extent of research and the directions of findings are summarized in the table below. Research is obviously more scanty for some activities than others; remember, too, that virtually none of the microteaching/minicourse and protocol research was done with college teachers and that most of the research on workshops was done with graduate teaching assistants. The great majority of studies (84%) provide at least some support for the activity in question. But that result is tempered by an examination of research quality, the first of two general issues I shall discuss.

Research quality. The great majority of studies support at least some aspect of the activity being evaluated, yet the 84% overall figure may be misleading. We rated each study on the degree of confidence we felt could be placed in its findings, based on criteria of sound research. We used three categories: low confidence, fair confidence, and high confidence. For low-confidence studies, the activity in question received support 93% of the time; for fair-confidence studies, 86% of the time; and for high-confidence studies, only 60%. There are several ways to interpret that finding, but it seems safe to say that the overall 84% figure is somewhat optimistic.

A phenomenological perspective is needed. The second issue involves a serious omission from this body of research. There is virtually no attention to events as *professors* experience them. Most studies adopt the conventions of experimental or quasi-experimental research. By those conventions, faculty participants are treated as objects under study, randomly assigned to treatments. Seldom does the researcher attempt to see phenomena, as it were, through the eyes of the professor. For example, none of the extensive research on the impact of student ratings on subsequent teaching examines how faculty process their feedback. The conceptualization is nearly as crude as Professor Fitch's "sink or swim" metaphor quoted above. Imagine faculty paddling in the treacherous currents of their

Effects of Teaching Improvement Strategies

Activity	*Number of Studies*	*Percent Supporting*
Workshops/Seminars	15	93%
Grants	1	100
Ratings	26	77
Microteaching/Minicourses	13	85
Protocols	16	87
Total	71	84%

classrooms. Some of them, randomly selected of course, are thrown a midterm life preserver in the form of ratings feedback from students. The researcher discusses whether the professors receiving feedback finish their swim in better shape than their colleagues who do not receive midterm ratings. But we also need to know what happens intellectually and emotionally to professors when they receive the ratings, how feedback affects their intentions, and how those intentions are translated into practice.

Many more examples of shortcomings in the conceptualizations and methodologies of this research could be cited. I emphasize them not because this audience is responsible for conducting such research but because many of you are in positions to influence the questions that research sets out to answer and to provide adequate support for more productive study of those questions.

Despite these reservations, I believe we do have a research base from which effective workshops, teaching evaluation systems, and other strategies can be designed. There is far more unknown than known, however, and we especially need a better understanding gained through qualitative research methods, of motivational variables that affect participation and influence benefits from such activties.

In closing, let me revisit the three views quoted at the beginning of this paper. I expect you share my rejection of the nineteenth-century "sink or swim" model. It is just as irresponsible to let faculty sink or swim with regard to improving their teaching as it is to let students sink or swim with regard to improving their learning. We have also surpassed, I hope, the graduate dean's praise of common sense. In my view, deans who extoll experience and common sense as sufficient for the development of teaching excellence hold views of the nature of professionals and the processes by which they develop so unsophisticated as to disqualify them from office. Finally, we come to Popham's search for activities to improve teaching that can be *prescribed* for faculty. This view, too, leaves me unsettled. First of all, we do not have such prescriptions and I doubt that they will be derived from research, given the complexities of teaching and learning. Second, use of prescriptions is in its own way anti-intellectual. We cannot expect much long-term success in training professors in someone else's technique, no matter how well validated the technique and the training may be. Our colleagues must themselves determine how they wish to change and develop. The best we can do is provide validated ideas and tools that may assist them to bring about self-identified changes.

References

Levinson, J. L., and Menges, R. J. "Improving College Teaching: A Critical Review of Research." Evanston, Ill.: Occasional Paper Number Thirteen, The Center for the Teaching Profession, 1979.

McAleese, R. "Staff Development in Higher Education 1961-78." *British Journal of Teacher Education*, 1979, *5*, 107-132.

Payne, F. "The Evaluation of Graduate School Teachers." In J. D. Russell, *Problems of Faculty Personnel*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1946. pp. 60-67.

Popham, W. J. "Higher Education's Commitment to Instructional Improvement Programs." *Educational Researcher*, 1974, *3* (11), 11-13.

Are Instructional Improvement Programs Off-Target?

Robert T. Blackburn, Glenn R. Pellino,
Alice Boberg and Colman O'Connell

Contemporary faculty development has its immediate antecedents in the 1950's. Sabbatical leave programs, travel money for faculty attendance at professional meetings, release time to complete higher degrees, faculty retreats, and encouragement to publish have been long-standing practices in higher education (Sikes and Barrett, 1976, p. 1). Then, with early efforts at student evaluations of their professors, professional development for faculty began to undergo perceptible change.

Centra (1976) reports that a 1960 survey of 214 southern colleges by Miller and Wilson found only a few one-shot faculty development programs designed to orient new faculty; there appeared to be very few well articulated, comprehensive programs. By the mid-1960's, a few programs aimed at instructional development had appeared, but it remained for the 1970's to see the coordination of traditional and newly conceived faculty development activities, designed to make college teaching more successful and satisfying for all involved (Sikes and Barrett, 1976, p. 1).

In the early 1970's faculty development seemed to sweep the country (Lindquist, 1978). Two national conferences marked the beginnings of national networks of practitioners and experts. (Longman, 1978, p. 25). By 1974 the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges had recognized the potential impact of the faculty development movement and launched a program to provide facilitators to assist more than 40 institutions in developing programs (Longman, 1978, p. 25). Also, in 1974, *Change Magazine* published a position paper, "Faculty Development in a Time of Retrenchment," by the Group for Human Development in Higher Education which, according to Lindquist (1978), inspired a humanistic wave in the faculty development movement, calling for assistance to professors to develop as persons in a humane environment.

John Centra's 1975 survey of 2,600 colleges prompted a response from 1,783. Close to 60 percent of the respondents, 1,044 (almost half of all higher education institutions), claimed to have programs of some type—evidence of the pace at which the movement had developed. By 1978 the concept had become an umbrella

Robert T. Blackburn is professor of higher education at the Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Michigan. Glenn R. Pellino and Alice Boberg are research associates at the Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Michigan. Sr. Colman O'Connell is director of planning at the College of St. Benedict. The conference presentation was given by Glenn R. Pellino.

term to incorporate a wide range of activities aimed at instructional, personal, and organizational development.

The University of Michigan project design

A project to evaluate some of these faculty development programs was undertaken by the Center for the Study of Higher Education at The University of Michigan in the fall of 1978 with assistance of a grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education.

The project included three major thrusts: (1) developing assessment instruments for judging the success of faculty development programs; (2) providing formative and summative evaluation for the programs of 24 participating institutions; and (3) exploring the effectiveness of a number of strategies aimed at faculty growth in a variety of institutional settings.

The first phase of the project, completed between October 1978 and May 1979, began with a review of the literature on faculty development. An instrument containing a jumbled list of 39 potential program goals was mailed to 56 selected experts (either practitioners or writers) across the country. Thirty-four responded by rating the items and suggesting criteria by which administrators might judge whether or not particular goals had been reached.

The goals receiving highest ratings by the expert respondents are shown in Figure 1. Instructional improvement goals were the clear priority of experts in the field. It is interesting to note that, for this group of faculty development experts, little concern is expressed for other aspects of the faculty professional life.

Figure 1: Expert-choices of goals

Highest

(4.500)* To create a climate in which the attainment of effective teaching is an ongoing concern.

(4.412) To increase the faculty's skills in instruction; for example, communication, use of technology, . . .

(4.294) To increase faculty responsiveness to student needs by the adaptation of their courses, . . .

(4.206) To increase the faculty's knowledge about the teaching-learning process.

(4.049) To increase the faculty's repertoire of teaching methods, through exposure to a variety of approaches . . .

Lowest

(1.471) To improve faculty professional consulting skills.

(2.029) To generate research on faculty development.

(2.147) To initiate a periodic review of the performance of all faculty members.

(2.176) To facilitate a faculty member's ability to participate in institutional decision-making.

(2.235) To improve faculty research and scholarship skills.

**Mean scores on a 5 (high) to 1 (low) importance scale.*

Twenty-four institutions were selected for the study based on Centra's (1976) factor analysis classification of programs. Centra's four classes of programs—high faculty involvement, instructional assistance practices, traditional practices, and emphasis on assessment—were used to construct a grid matrix with community colleges, four-year colleges, and universities. After negotiations with presidents and faculty development directors, site visits were set up for December 1978 to March 1979.

Researchers interviewed individuals on each campus concerned with faculty development activities—deans, presidents, faculty development directors, committee members, and faculty who both favored and were critical of programs. After the site visit, they drafted a description of the program and returned it to the faculty development directors for review. The researchers then analyzed these case studies to develop a process model for managing the evaluation.

Phase three consisted of the design and administration of a set of survey instruments. There were seven in all: four principal ones on the faculty role, on teaching, on scholarship, and on program evaluation (plus a demographic sheet); and two secondary ones on faculty viewing students, and on administrators defining scholarly activity for their faculty. These were presented to faculty from each institutional type, modified, critiqued by experts in the field, and eventually mailed in various combinations to random stratified samples of faculty. (The classifications and abbreviations for the institution types are shown in Figure 2.)

The returns are displayed in Table 1. As can be seen, there is a variety in the response rate—from margainal to extraordinarily large. In all, the numbers are more than adequate to proceed with confidence in the findings. (We have retest reliability and validity data to analyze. Preliminary runs show both to be high.) Faculty responses to the project's surveys are presented in a number of tables. Some

Figure 2: Institutional abbreviations

CC: community/junior colleges, private and public.

LAC: liberal arts college; all are private/residential/B.A. or B.S. degree.

U: universities, private and public.

The A and B essentially follow The Carnegie Commission classification (1976): "B" tends to mean more selective (and "A" less selective) with regard to student ability in the case of the "LAC's." This is also true with respect to the "U's." In the case of the "U's," an "A" most often collects the regional universities that have few if any doctoral programs. The "B's" tend to be research-oriented universities.

Note: The percentage sums in the tables sometimes differ slightly from 100 percent because of rounding.

Table 1: Response rates

	CC	LAC-A	LAC-B	U-A	U-B	Overall
N	460	146	425	339	427	1797
Average (%)	45	65	62	45	40	48
Range (%)	38-84	51-90	61-72	39-56	32-44	32-90

presentations highlight the similarities and differences across categories of institutions—community/junior colleges, more and less selective liberal arts colleges, regional universities, and research universities. Other tables focus on a set of factors within a college or university context.

The importance of teaching

As Table 2 clearly demonstrates, faculty value very highly their teaching role, irrespective of institutional type. Faculty in two-year colleges are more emphatic than those in research universities. When the "agree with reservations" and "strongly agree" are combined and when the "considerable" and "great" are aggregated, the importance of teaching reaches as high as 99 percent.

The items in the lower half of Table 2 show that faculty—and that means *all* faculty—believe they value teaching more highly than do their colleagues. (Note the right hand columns.)

About 90 percent of the faculty judge themselves above average or superior teachers, again irrespective of institutional type or level. (See Table 3.) They are not fully confident that students will judge them to be as talented as they believe they are but then, one supposes, students really are not qualified to recognize outstanding pedagogy when they see it. (In another question, 90 percent believe they are getting better each year.)

Before taking these impossible statistical outcomes as prima facie evidence that faculty have a seriously distorted self-image and grossly overrate the quality of their teaching, a recent study (Erickson, 1978) at the University of Michigan—the type of institution where undergraduate instruction is claimed to be the very worst—found 90 percent of the faculty rated in the upper two categories by students, a result almost identical to the one presented here. Moreover, Gaff found that 99 percent of the faculty scored themselves as above average. This was true for both participants and non-participants in faculty development programs. And Baldwin's (1979) study of liberal arts college faculty uncovered similar corroborating evidence. Faculty don't believe they have any problem with their teaching.

Their colleagues, however, are not quite as good. That is what faculty think. Furthermore, faculty believe the students will document their assertion: I don't need help, but my peers do.

Table 4 shows how faculty reach the judgments they do with respect to how good they are as pedagogues. Here the data are presented within contextual settings. The patterns differ slightly in each setting but in the main they base their self-ratings on self-assessment and the performance of their students. Informed student opinion is taken into consideration but they value colleague feedback much less so and administrative response the least of all. In fact, research university faculty essentially find it valueless.

In short, faculty apparently have a highly internal set of criteria for judging their classroom performance, one which is supported by their personal experience with students but is relatively free from colleagues' and supervisors' opinions.

The elements of superior teaching

Table 5 provides another perspective on how faculty view their teaching role. Within each institutional setting faculty overwhelmingly assert the importance of knowing their discipline. This item receives two to three times as many "great importance" votes as any other element. Having appropriate facilities is not all that important but it apparently is difficult to be a superior instructor without qualified, motivated students and an effective personality.

Table 2. Importance of teaching (in percents)

	Institutional type	(N)	Strongly disagree	Disagree with reservations	Agree with reservations	Strongly agree
Teaching is the most important part of the academic role.	CC	(277)	1	2	29	68
	LAC-A	(113)	3	3	38	57
	LAC-B	(201)	<1	7	34	59
	U-A	(238)	3	6	37	54
	U-B	(213)	4	14	46	37
Teaching is the most rewarding aspect of my professional life.	CC	(291)	<1	6	40	54
	LAC-A	(72)	1	6	28	65
	LAC-B	(222)	2	8	43	47
	U-A	(185)	3	12	44	41
	U-B	(286)	4	18	51	27

			Little	Moderate	Considerable	Great
Faculty members vary with respect to the importance they attach to teaching. Indicate the degree of importance you attach to teaching.	CC	(285)	0	1	14	85
	LAC-A	(70)	0	1	13	86
	LAC-B	(215)	<1	2	18	80
	U-A	(176)	0	2	19	80
	U-B	(269)	<1	5	23	71
How much importance do you think your departmental colleagues attach to their teaching?	CC	(296)	0	9	47	45
	LAC-A	(74)	1	5	31	62
	LAC-B	(224)	<1	6	41	52
	U-A	(184)	<1	13	54	33
	U-B	(288)	3	24	48	25

Table 3. The quality of teaching

	Institutional type	Poor	Acceptable	Average	Above average	Superior
How would you rate your teaching?	CC	0	1	7	72	20
	LAC-A	0	1	9	61	30
	LAC-B	<1	1	10	64	24
	U-A	0	0	11	62	27
	U-B	0	3	14	58	25
How do you think students would rate your teaching?	CC	0	2	12	69	17
	LAC-A	0	3	13	56	29
	LAC-B	<1	1	18	58	22
	U-A	0	2	18	61	19
	U-B	0	4	18	58	20
How would you rate the teaching of the majority of the members of your department (academic unit)?	CC	0	2	24	66	8
	LAC-A	1	1	16	67	14
	LAC-B	2	4	25	62	8
	U-A	<1	5	28	62	4
	U-B	2	7	38	48	4
How do you think students would rate the teaching of a majority of the members of your department?	CC	<1	2	33	57	7
	LAC-A	0	4	19	64	13
	LAC-B	2	4	25	62	8
	U-A	1	8	31	58	2
	U-B	2	10	35	49	5

Table 4: Sources for evaluating teaching responses

Responses by institutional type to the question: "In assessing your classroom performance, how valuable do you find the following sources of information?"

	Value level			
	Little	Moderate	Considerable	Great
CC (N = 291)				
Systematic student ratings	11	33	39	17
Informal student opinion	1	21	49	30
Self-assessment	2	16	50	33
Colleague feedback	9	27	48	17
Administrator feedback	18	39	33	11
Achievement reflected in student tests and papers	2	18	48	33
LAC-A (N = 71)				
Systematic student ratings	16	17	50	19
Informal student opinion	4	23	49	24
Self-assessment	1	11	49	38
Colleague feedback	7	34	34	25
Administrator feedback	26	34	31	9
Achievement reflected in student tests and papers	3	11	46	40
LAC-B (N = 275)				
Systematic student ratings	15	36	37	13
Informal student opinion	4	29	45	22
Self-assessment	2	12	48	39
Colleague feedback	15	32	39	15
Administrator feedback	44	34	19	3
Achievement reflected in student tests and papers	2	15	45	37
U-A (N = 71)				
Systematic student ratings	14	41	31	14
Informal student opinion	7	25	48	21
Self-assessment	2	10	47	41
Colleague feedback	14	34	34	18
Administrator feedback	40	27	22	10
Achievement reflected in student tests and papers	3	12	52	33
U-B (N = 288)				
Systematic student ratings	17	42	27	14
Informal student opinion	6	25	45	23
Self-assessment	2	13	49	35
Colleague feedback	22	35	31	11
Administrator feedback	52	31	15	1
Achievement reflected in student tests and papers	6	15	45	35

Table 5. The elements of superior teaching

Response by institutional type to the instruction: "Indicate the importance of the following in accounting for superior teaching."

	Importance Level			
	Little	Moderate	Considerable	Great
CC (N = 300)				
Knowledge of the subject matter	0	<1	21	78
Instructor's personality	<1	15	44	41
Methods/techniques used	1	12	50	37
Specified training for teaching	15	31	34	19
Qualified and motivated students	2	23	52	23
Appropriate physical facilities	5	37	41	16
Active in research/ scholarship	33	44	18	5
LAC-A (N = 76)				
Knowledge of the subject matter	0	1	24	75
Instructor's personality	0	12	49	39
Methods/techniques used	1	17	35	47
Specified training for teaching	16	27	32	25
Qualified and motivated students	3	23	45	30
Appropriate physical facilities	3	45	37	15
Active in research/ scholarship	20	37	31	12
LAC-B (N = 225)				
Knowledge of the subject matter	<1	1	24	74
Instructor's personality	<1	13	48	38
Methods/techniques used	3	15	52	31
Specified training for teaching	31	40	23	7
Qualified and motivated students	1	23	42	34
Appropriate physical facilities	9	40	42	9
Active in research/ scholarship	13	31	37	20

Table 5, continued

	Importance Level			
	Little	Moderate	Considerable	Great
U-A (N = 187)				
Knowledge of the subject matter	0	2	24	74
Instructor's personality	1	16	51	31
Methods/techniques used	4	13	50	32
Specified training for teaching	27	36	25	12
Qualified and motivated students	2	20	44	34
Appropriate physical facilities	7	39	43	12
Active in research/ scholarship	14	34	34	19
U-B (N = 292)				
Knowledge of the subject matter	<1	2	22	75
Instructor's personality	2	21	50	27
Methods/techniques used	4	26	48	22
Specified training for teaching	28	45	19	8
Qualified and motivated students	3	16	51	30
Appropriate physical facilities	11	42	38	9
Active in research/ scholarship	6	31	34	29

There are some differences across institutional types and levels. For example, research university faculty attach an appreciably higher importance to being actively engaged in research/scholarship as an essential ingredient of the superior professor than do other faculty. And the importance of research diminishes steadily from regional university to selective liberal arts college to less selective liberal arts college to two-year college. On the other hand, community college faculty award higher importance to special teacher training and to teaching strategies used than do university faculty.

What emerges, then, is a picture of the academic as expert. The professor's task is to transmit knowledge and skill to able people who agree with her or his goals. The data do not describe faculty who would champion interdisciplinary courses (where they would have to teach something they are not a master of). The data do not paint pictures of academics concerned about student growth and development. Nor do the data depict professors who see their instructional role as one of helping students learn how to learn. Rather, these are people who have the truth and who feel their task is to spread the gospel.

Methods of instruction

The developing portrait is brought into sharper focus by the faculty reports on how they teach. The questionnaire asked faculty to describe the first undergraduate class they meet each week. This technique provided a wide assortment of courses and avoided a bias in faculty selecting their favorite or typical teaching style. It also gave a mix of class sizes and student levels (freshmen through seniors).

Table 6: Methods of instruction

Institutional type	Principal method: Lecture	Discussion	Recitation	Lab/shop	Applied (music)	Individualized
CC	76	7	1	7	4	1
LAC-A	80	9	2	3	2	3
LAC-B	73	12	1	5	4	1
U-A	78	4	0	6	6	1
U-B	83	8	1	3	3	1
	Second method					
CC	6	47	0	31	8	0
LAC-A	4	66	2	13	0	0
LAC-B	8	57	2	22	3	1
U-A	4	58	2	26	8	2
U-B	7	47	5	34	3	1

As Table 6 shows, however, there are only minor differences across institutional settings. Give a faculty almost any kind of a class in any subject, large or small, upper or lower division, and they will lecture.

Institutional rewards and pressures

Thus far the data have focused on intrinsic factors affecting faculty behavior and desires. Before turning to how faculty who participated in faculty development programs judged the success of these efforts to achieve their goals, let us examine how faculty perceive their institution's performance expectations, that is, what they see the extrinsic rewards and pressures to be.

Faculty rated the extent to which their college or university rewards 11 specific activities, which fall under the general rubrics of teaching, research, and service. For the most part the responses were what one would expect. Public service was on the bottom with committee work and advising students not far behind for all types of institution. Curriculum revision is rewarded moderately in community colleges and in the less selective liberal arts colleges but not in the other three groups. Classroom teaching and innovative teaching are recognized to a great extent in community and in liberal arts colleges, but not in universities. On the other hand, faculty report research publication and grant-getting are highly rewarded in universities but appreciably less so in the other three college groups.

The more interesting findings appear when faculty expressed their

Table 7: Changes in college/university reward structure in the past five years

	College/University Emphasis *(in percents)*			
	Less	Same	More	Don't know
CC				
Classroom teaching	6	55	17	23
Innovative teaching	9	45	26	20
Curriculum revision	7	39	33	21
Research and publication	7	63	7	24
Obtaining grants	2	33	39	25
LAC-A				
Classroom teaching	4	32	33	32
Innovative teaching	1	30	40	29
Curriculum revision	2	33	37	28
Research and publication	7	48	15	30
Obtaining grants	1	35	32	32
LAC-B				
Classroom teaching	6	50	20	24
Innovative teaching	4	42	32	23
Curriculum revision	4	42	32	23
Research and publication	5	41	32	22
Obtaining grants	3	33	40	25
U-A				
Classroom teaching	18	39	17	27
Innovative teaching	18	34	31	27
Curriculum revision	5	39	30	25
Research and publication	4	23	49	24
Obtaining grants	2	18	54	26
U-B				
Classroom teaching	14	44	23	19
Innovative teaching	6	50	22	22
Curriculum revision	4	48	26	22
Research and publication	3	32	47	18
Obtaining grants	2	33	42	24

opinions on the degree to which their institution's reward structure has changed over the past five years on a number of these role behaviors. (See Table 7). While the most frequent response is the "same," the perception of increased emphasis outdistances decreased emphasis by a factor of five or more, and in some instances is greater than the no-change category. If administrators are transmitting the message that obtaining a grant will be rewarded, faculty have received it—in two-year colleges as well as in research universities.

Another important inference to be drawn from these data is the increased pressures faculty must be feeling in their fundamental roles of teaching and scholarship.

The participant population

As in most studies of faculty participants and non-participants in the adoption and implementation of innovations (see Rogers and Shoemaker, 1971, for example), these two groups differ little from each other on most demographic characteristics. They come from all ranks, with participants being a shade younger. Both the tenured and the non-tenured participate, although those who have been at the institution a shorter time do so in a somewhat greater ratio. That women are more likely to have engaged in faculty development activities than men is a novel and unexplained finding. They most likely are the younger academics in addition to being newer at the institution. Hence their overrepresentation may be a consequence of these two factors and not related to gender. In the main, though, participants are a representative segment of the faculty.

Program effectiveness

Table 8 displays the six most frequently mentioned types of program faculty participated in. On-campus workshops are far ahead of all the others in frequency. However, they receive the lowest grades. Leaves (sabbaticals, for example) earn the highest mark. The (N) here is small, however, and this result must be taken with some caution.

From the array of benefits shown in Table 9, faculty say they have gained

Table 8: Program effectiveness

Responses (in percent) to the following question regarding their principal contact with their institution's program: "How productive was your involvement in the program relative to the time you spent in it?"

Program Type		Productivity Level				
	(N)	Not at all	Partial	Moderate	High	Very High
On-campus workshops	312	10	13	41	23	14
Off-campus workshops	26	0	12	35	19	35
Consultations	56	5	7	18	48	21
Leaves	12	0	0	17	25	58
Grants	60	0	10	13	37	40
Taking a course/ attending seminar	11	0	9	82	0	9

Table 9: Benefits of participation ranked

Rankings were determined by combining responses labeled "much" and "great deal" of benefit—the top two of a four-point scale. Percents are shown in parentheses.

	Workshops on campus	Grants	Consul-tations	Conferences off campus	Leaves & sabbaticals	Courses & seminars
New perspectives on teaching and learning in general	8.5 (42)	9 (47)	3 (64)	5 (48)	4.5 (67)	10 (36)
Greater awareness of your own teaching assumptions and practices	4 (49)	8 (50)	1 (74)	4 (52)	8.5 (58)	2 (54)
Knowledge about alternative instruction procedures	6.5 (43)	7 (54)	5 (56)	6.5 (48)	12 (42)	13 (27)
Skill in using new instructional procedures	12 (27)	14 (36)	8.5 (41)	15 (32)	14 (33)	3 (54)
Support or confirmation of your previous ideas and practices	2 (57)	3 (60)	2 (67)	2 (56)	4.5 (67)	5 (45)
Contact with interesting people from other parts of the institution	1 (65)	2 (60)	6 (50)	1 (60)	10 (50)	1 (64)
Information about other resources, people, and materials for use in your teaching	5 (48)	6 (56)	11 (38)	3 (54)	2.5 (75)	6 (45)
Greater support from the institution for your teaching	14 (24)	12 (40)	14.5 (20)	12 (36)	6.5 (58)	14 (27)
A broader understanding of faculty development	10 (41)	11 (41)	10 (40)	11 (40)	11 (50)	15 (18)
Personal growth or renewal	8.5 (42)	5 (58)	8.5 (41)	6.5 (48)	2.5 (75)	12 (27)
Increasing motivation or stimulation for teaching excellence	3 (53)	1 (66)	4 (61)	9 (48)	1 (83)	4 (50)
Better understanding of students	11 (34)	15 (34)	7 (43)	13.5 (12)	13 (42)	11 (30)
Better relationships with students	13 (26)	13 (39)	13 (30)	13.5 (12)	15 (18)	8 (40)
Better relationships with colleagues	6.5 (43)	10 (43)	12 (35)	9 (48)	8.5 (58)	8 (40)
Increased scholarly activity	15 (20)	4 (58)	14.5 (20)	9 (48)	6.5 (58)	8 (40)

information about teaching resources, have increased their awareness of their teaching practices and the assumptions underlying these, have acquired knowledge about alternative instructional procedures, and have been motivated and stimulated towards excellence in teaching. These were goals for faculty development programs and they appear to have been successfully achieved.

On the other end of the spectrum, matters relating to students—better understanding and better relationships—rank at or near the bottom and are never mentioned by half the faculty. Obviously, these instructional development goals have not been achieved by the various programs.

It is also interesting to note that what was no doubt an unintended program outcome received some of the highest rankings. Through their program's activities faculty increased interactions with their peers. They judged this discovery of colleagues to be a very strong benefit.

Finally, what is perhaps the most striking outcome of all is the statement that received the highest average ranking of the 15, namely, support or confirmation of the faculty member's previous ideas and practices. It is not immediately obvious what interpretation should be given to this result. One possibility is that faculty have learned little new but rather now have evidence to support what they have always believed and practiced. But this inference is not consistent with other benefits faculty say they have had from participation. A second interpretation would find this outcome to be but one more dimension of the faculty psyche—they view themselves as able pedagogues.

In any event, having seen what faculty say they have gained from participation in these programs, the final step is to see what faculty needs are and what pressures they feel so that some overall assessments can be made about the appropriateness of current faculty development programs.

Faculty professional development needs

Table 10 shows the priority faculty assigned to developing various aspects of their professional performance. Improving teaching in the classroom remains the faculty's number one desire, even though they already rate themselves as above-average teachers. This need is stronger in the colleges (over 70 percent) than in the more complex institutions, especially in the research universities (49 percent). In these settings the demands on faculty are more diverse, as was seen earlier. The desire is to improve classroom teaching in general, however, more than it is to work on specific pedagogical techniques.

The desire to improve interpersonal skills received the second highest average percentage. What factors led to this response are not known. Manuscript preparation and publication received strikingly high ranking for liberal arts college faculty where past practice in these institutions has not emphasized traditional scholarship.

Some pressures and strains on faculty

A second way of seeing how well the fit is between professional development programs and faculty needs is to examine the relationship between how faculty spend their time, how they prefer to allocate their efforts, and what they believe their institution expects. Table 11 contains these data for the three faculty roles by type of institution. There are few differences across institutional categories in the service area. As far as teaching is concerned, university faculty teach less than their colleagues at other institutions (although it is still their principal activity) and spend more time on scholarship, especially in research universities.

Table 10: Professional development desires

Rankings of responses to the question: "Concerning your professional growth, to what extent do you desire to improve or enhance your skills and knowledge in each of the following?" Rankings were determined by combining responses labeled "a very great deal" and "a lot"—the top two of a five-point scale. Percents are shown in parentheses.

Teaching	CC	LAC-A	LAC-B	U-A	U-B
Teaching in the classroom	1 (73)	1 (72)	1 (76)	1 (65)	1 (49)
Constructing examinations	2.5 (50)	7 (36)	6.5 (35)	9 (34)	7.5 (29)
Using audio-visual equipment	8 (35)	11 (26)	11 (22)	11 (21)	11 (17)
Writing instructional objectives	12 (27)	12 (22)	12 (15)	12 (20)	12 (12)
Revising courses	4 (46)	3 (47)	3 (52)	7.5 (35)	9 (28)
Research					
Computer use	9 (32)	6 (43)	4 (47)	4 (42)	4 (37)
Proposal writing (for funding)	10.5 (28)	10 (33)	6.5 (35)	3 (43)	3 (40)
Manuscript preparation and publication	10.5 (28)	4 (46)	5 (44)	2 (48)	2 (46)
Service					
Improving consulting skills	6 (40)	8 (35)	8 (33)	5.5 (38)	7.5 (29)
Personal					
Interpersonal skills	2.5 (50)	2 (50)	2 (53)	5.5 (38)	5 (33)
Career options	7 (37)	9 (34)	9 (29)	10 (29)	10 (25)
Health	5 (44)	5 (44)	10 (27)	7.5 (35)	6 (31)

Sources of strain can be observed, however, when actual and preferred time expenditures are contrasted. The agreement between the percentage of the workload allocated to teaching and the institution's expectation is high. However, faculty would prefer to teach less, from 5 to 7 percent less. A similar preference is expressed by faculty for reduction in the amount of time spent in the service role, but not by the institution. It expects more.

Arithmetically, then, the increases have to appear in the scholarly role, and they do. All institutions expect more time to be given to scholarship than faculty now give. Furthermore, faculty want to give more effort to this activity, even more than the institution expects. In the research area, the differences between actual and preferred range from 8 to 13 percent. In fact, two-year college faculty would prefer to give more time to scholarship than regional university faculty currently are, a 28 percent increase over their current effort.

Pressure in the research role was seen earlier when faculty reported how institutions reward grant-getting. It is seen here in the "expected" versus "actual" times. The former always total more. In fact, in regional universities they reach 112 percent.

Responses to other questions in our survey support this contention regarding job-felt pressures. While only about one-third of the two-year faculty agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that "to be a vital teacher one must be actively engaged in research," the percentages for four-year and university faculty ranged from one-half to three-quarters. The same general results were found for the assertions that "the academic role includes an obligation to do research" and "the greatest satisfaction for academicians is making a contribution to their field of knowledge." Since it is only a fraction of the academic profession who do publish, such a high level of desire suggests an appreciable gap between actual and

Table 11: Time allocation—actual, preferred, and expected

Mean percents are shown. Percents total more than 100%; uncorrected-faculty responses were used.

	CC	LAC-A	LAC-B	U-A	U-B
Teaching					
Actual	65	61	65	59	50
Preferred	60	55	58	54	43
Institution's expectation	65	61	63	59	48
Scholarship					
Actual	15	14	16	18	29
Preferred	23	26	29	29	42
Institution's expectation	16	19	23	25	37
Service					
Actual	22	29	21	25	26
Preferred	19	24	16	20	20
Institution's expectation	26	34	23	28	25
Totals					
Actual	102	104	102	102	105
Preferred	102	105	103	103	105
Institution's expectation	107	104	109	112	110

desired job performance. Faculty want both to satisfy personal creative desires and institutional expectations in the research domain.

Conclusions

While faculty development programs merit accolades, it may well be that their tendency to concentrate on the faculty member's instructional role has been overemphasized or even possibly misdirected. Faculty relegate to myth the idea that there is an epidemic of poor teaching in higher education. And, although faculty committees may vote for instructional improvement programs, it is not, as has been seen, because *they* need one, but because they believe *their colleagues* do—who, of course, do not share this assessment.

This should not be taken to mean that faculty are not concerned about their teaching. They most certainly are. But, from the perspective of professional growth needs, this concern is related less to matters of pedagogy than to the need for keeping abreast of one's discipline—the dimension faculty believe to be the single most important ingredient of superior teaching. It is probably for this reason that programs which had as their major component either leaves or grants were perceived by the faculty to be most beneficial.

As to the question of which type of program offers the greatest payoff, much depends on the outcomes one is seeking. For example, workshops appear to be most helpful in stimulating awareness about teaching and simply offering faculty opportunity for interaction. However, if one sets out to really challenge faculty assumptions about teaching and to present alternative approaches to instruction, faculty rate consultation with colleagues or experts as far superior.

Let us turn now to perhaps the more important question, that is, the place

of instructional development within the larger context of professional development for faculty. As noted earlier, faculty development experts tend to equate faculty development with enhancing faculty instructional skills to the exclusion both of content specialization and attention to other aspects of the faculty role. It is here that faculty most profoundly disagree. Faculty perceive their professional development needs to be far broader than those accommodated by most faculty development programs. For example, concern for increasing one's skill in the area of research and scholarship seems to be particularly acute at this time. This probably reflects both a natural desire on the part of faculty to broaden their professional lives as well as a realistic response to changing pressures within their institutional reward structures.

From the perspective of faculty, then, it is the other professional development needs—as well as some personal ones—that faculty development programs need to focus on more.

References

Baldwin, Roger G. "The Faculty Career Process—Continuity and Change: A Study of College Professors at Five Stages of the Academic Career," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Michigan, 1979.

Centra, John A. *Faculty Development Practices in United States Colleges and Universities*. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, November 1976.

Ericksen, Stanford C. "The Dimensions of Merit." *Memo to the Faculty*. The University of Michigan, No. 61, December 1978.

Gaff, Jerry. Mimeographed paper, PIRIT project, undated.

Group for Human Development in Higher Education, *Faculty Development in a Time of Retrenchment*. New Rochelle, N.Y.: Change Magazine, 1974.

Lindquist, Jack. *Designing Teaching Improvement Programs*. Berkeley, Cal.: Pacific Soundings Press, 1978.

Longman, Karen A. "Faculty Development in a Period of Retrenchment," unpublished preliminary doctoral examination, Center for the Study of Higher Education, The University of Michigan, 1978.

Rogers, Everett M., and Shoemaker, F. Floyd. *Communication of Innovations*. New York: The Free Press, 1971.

Sikes W., and Barret, L. *Case Studies on Faculty Development*. Washington, D.C.: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, 1976.

What Are the Obstacles to Improving Quality Teaching?

Hans O. Mauksch

Typically, the quality of teaching is thought to be a direct function of the talents, efforts, and resources of the teacher—the product of the individual actor. But there is an alternative view; indeed, a strong case can be made for viewing the quality of teaching as a function of the social environment, the social arrangements, and the social belief systems within which teaching occurs. This posture, therefore, treats the teacher's performance as a dependent variable. In any effective and comprehensive effort to improve the standards and quality of postsecondary teaching in the United States, the cultural and organizational environment within which teaching occurs must be the target for change. The individual teacher becomes simultaneously the product of these structures and an integral part of the environment itself.

The components of the environment are familiar, yet rarely, if ever have they been systematically perceived as an interdependent network of constraints and obstacles in which the teacher is victim or villain, hero or pawn. For each environmental component there is a set of beliefs and a structure of social arrangements that affect the quality of the teaching process.

Teaching as an innate talent

Among the most pervasive obstacles to the development of a quality system of teaching is the belief that a teacher's performance is primarily a reflection of that person's talents and native gifts. The widely held notion that teachers are born rather than educated is central to an observation of teacher careers and teacher employment.

Let us compare the teacher and the violinist. For the latter, society has accepted the coexistence of learned competence and individually achieved excellence. The social and institutional environment of the violinist requires, encourages, and rewards efforts to learn, practice, work hard, and achieve competence as a direct outcome of diligence. We also recognize that among those who achieve competence there is a range of endowment and talent and that, beyond the level of competence, a selected few will reach a level of excellence that is an individual and unique achievement. Achieving competence is based on social arrangements and a socially expected and rewarded pathway of learning.

The postsecondary higher education field lacks beliefs, arrangements, and encouragement to achieve teaching competence through deliberate learning efforts. On the contrary, such efforts are devalued if not disparaged. Unlike the violinist, who achieves competence through learning and work, the teacher is thought to

Hans O. Mauksch is professor of sociology and professor of family and community medicine at the University of Missouri, Columbia, and director of the Projects on Teaching Undergraduate Sociology of the American Sociological Association.

become competent as a semi-annointed byproduct of the doctoral degree. Without rewards for those who work at the teaching process, the academic community expects the virtuoso, the unique talent, to arise and shine in the classroom.

Performing, as violinist or teacher, combines competence in the performing process with expertise in the substantive area, be it music or one of the academic arts and sciences. Expertise in theories of music and knowledge of every violin sonata does not make for a competent performance with the bow. Without adequate training with the instrument, no one would expect the expert to be a performer. Yet this is precisely what we do in the academic community. Presumed knowledge of a subject matter is a license to teach without acknowledging that the teacher's instrument, the use of himself or herself, requires skills and practice. The belief systems surrounding the nature of teaching and the arrangements by which teachers are selected and employed practically prevent the development and maintenance of a cadre of competent teachers. It has not blocked the emergence of those few masters of the classroom who, overcoming absence of training and support systems, perform as individual virtuosos. The crucial consequences of these beliefs lie in the absence of effective social arrangements to require, encourage, and reward the acquisition of teaching competence for the majority of those who teach. These beliefs have supported norms which make it undesirable, if not embarrassing, to admit that learning about teaching ought to be a good thing.

Classroom privacy

Linked to this set of beliefs about the innate qualities of teaching, is another, fascinating belief that teaching is a private activity which should not be subject to observation and examination. Under the mantle of academic freedom, teaching is a secluded activity while research, also concerned with deeply felt issues of academic freedom, is acknowledged as an accountable and challengable activity, properly subject to scrutiny and checks. While challenging the methodology and techniques of the researcher does not threaten his or her right to pursue inquiry, the presence of a visitor in the classroom is felt as limiting the teacher's right to choose teaching content and teaching process. Although there may be some risk that those in power will wield inappropriate influence over either teaching or research, the mere presence of a colleague, in and of itself, is no threat to the freedom of teaching. Rather, what the norms and arrangements protecting the privacy of teaching really reflect is the absence of a rational basis for teaching and the defensive postures characteristic of low-power status groups.

The belief in the privacy of teaching is also reflected in the shape and process of the undergraduate curriculum, though with considerable variations among disciplines. The literature points to the problem of discontinuity that pervades undergraduate curricula. Yet belief in the privacy of the classroom colors demands for accountability with the idea of "un-freedom" and imposition. Structuring the teaching process into identifiable objectives and outcomes to serve as building blocks for next courses implies the existence of a rational, replicable system of teaching. This is contrary to the prevailing myths of the collegiate classroom. Administrative regulations and requirements cannot be imposed on a network of customs and beliefs without understanding, acknowledging, and addressing these value systems and their relationship to the desired policies. The teacher must accept that the 300-level course ought to build on some predictable outcomes from a 200-level course, and conversely, that this 300-level course is accountable for certain achievements to the teacher of the 400-level course. Only if the interdependence of curriculum components becomes part of the faculty norms

and results in expectations among teachers, will such arrangements as course outlines, curriculum plans, and reports rise above ritualism and power play.

Teaching without training

This network of beliefs and social arrangements is interdependent and interlinked. Just as teaching is seen to be based on talent, and is assumed to represent subject-matter expertise, the preparation of future teachers in most university settings is an expression of these belief and culture systems, which characterize academia in particular and society in general. In substantive fields of the arts and sciences, doctoral programs appropriately emphasize research training; however, they do so at the exclusion of any concern with education for the teaching function.

Graduate students are given responsibilities as teaching assistants generally with minimal or no systematic preparation for competence in the teaching process. Few higher education institutions make any attempt at a systematic, scholarly exploration of the teaching function; and the teaching seminars that are offered vary from gripe sessions to "show-and-tell" gatherings. A teaching assistantship is frequently awarded to a student who shows promise as a future researcher and the prevailing norm is that the teaching assistantship serves to provide financial support for those in the process of gaining research competence. Thus, the whole environment makes the choice of a teacher role seem second rate, undesirable, and almost tantamount to failure; while it demonstrates the prestige and value of an academic research career. The promising, high-achieving student who tells a professor that teaching is his or her career objective would probably be labeled as not quite normal, a loser, and someone either to be rescued or written off as far as future faculty attention is concerned.

Minority group mentality

The most pernicious consequence of the low status of teaching and the research bias is the internalization of low self-worth among those who choose to teach. Studies of minority groups such as blacks and women, have demonstrated the powerful and destructive consequences of the accepted message that "I am in a lower caste." While no one would identify himself or herself as "only" a researcher, the message that "I am only a teacher" is confronted continuously by those who work with teachers. The acceptance of lower status includes the internalization of a sense of powerlessness or low worth, and of being moved by external forces rather than being a mover of factors over which one has control. Such is the environment and the value context in which we educate those who primarily teach. This also is the context in which those who plan to combine teaching and research are led to eschew their identity as teachers and to concentrate on their research selves. In the light of what we know about the socialization of males and females in a sexist society, we can dramatize this issue by assuming that the graduate student enters doctoral studies as a neuter, becomes a male when choosing to be a researcher, or a female, should teaching be the career choice.

Although it may seem forced, I would argue that a great deal can be learned from applying knowledge about minority groups to the teacher. Dominant values, the processes of socialization, and the social world of the teacher are not unlike those of other minority groups. It seems that all minority groups—blacks, women, and teachers alike—are kept in their place by the prevailing myths that their presumed talents and characteristics are innate rather than

achieved and that their contributions are the consequences of natural talents rather than professionally and technically acquired skills. Unlike blacks or females, the teacher is not easily identifiable by physical characteristics. Yet in fleeting social contacts, such as the random seating arrangements on an airplane, it has been shown that the self-identification as professor elicits very different responses from the random neighbor than the introduction, "I am a teacher."

Since the postsecondary environment provides a choice of both of these identities, it is no wonder that those who can, prefer to be professors rather than teachers. Within the academic community, the daily experience, values, environment, and resources available separate the real worlds of the senior professor at a major university from that of the young teacher at a small college. This inequality of environment and experience is aggravated by the structure of of disciplinary associations. The well-published scholar from the university of good reputation is simply more likely to be known and thus to be elected to office than the diligent teacher in the remote institution, known only to students and immediate colleagues. Thus the plight and need of teachers is rarely the agenda of disciplinary bodies since those who represent their colleagues in fact only know the privileged few. By and large, those in national office are confined to knowing the university.

Organizational models of teaching

Any postsecondary institution, particularly a university, is a complex organization which is best understood by seeing it as a mixture of several simultaneously co-existing, profoundly different social systems that compete with each other for recognition and dominance. To many, particularly to administrators, the collegiate institution is a bureaucratic structure with lines of authority, positions of responsibility, and formal systems of delegation. Within this framework, the teacher is an agent of the institution, discharging a duty based on the institution's contract with students and on its policies and regulations. Yet, simultaneously, the university also is a federation of "local chapters" of national disciplinary systems reflecting the norms, the customs, and the expectations of academic associations and organizations. Anyone observing a departmental faculty meeting must be aware that this view of the real world has normative strength and is at variance, and sometimes in conflict with the formal organizational model. Vis á vis other departments, administrators, and trustees, the teacher in higher education represents his or her discipline. This subculture includes orientation to knowledge, priorities for faculty activities, and—as many administrators know—different postures toward authority.

A third model can be observed, particularly in universities. The individual scholar perceives him- or herself as entering a contract with the employing institution. The professor remains essentially a free agent who agrees to provide teaching services in exchange for the physical and administrative opportunities for pursuing research and scholarship. To the extent that this perception prevails, teaching all too easily becomes a contractual obligation to be discharged as efficiently and painlessly as possible, somewhat akin to the clinic service that physicians are expected to assume in exchange for the privilege of admitting their private patients to the hospital. This model can also lead the professor to perceive him- or herself as an individual missionary of knowledge and wisdom, thus teaching as an entrepreneur rather than as a member of a system.

Somewhat more complex is a fourth organizational model. Following industrial patterns, the college or the university is seen as a power system of profoundly different interest groups, i.e., administration, faculty, students—and

of late—support staff. Behavior reflecting this perception is by no means confined to the unionized campus, but can be observed at any institution. It reflects the almost inevitable search by any group for collective safeguarding of their interests. It is significant to examine whether this competing collectivities model concentrates on control over conditions of employment or on control over conditions of practice. Collective action in support of conditions of employment need not diminish the minority self-image or the sense of powerlessness in one's professional role. In contrast, collective stance and collective concern regarding control over conditions of practice are linked to role assertiveness and thus, conceivably, can favor the emergence of pride and self-worth. The quality of teaching is subtly but profoundly linked to the delicate balancing of definitions or organizational realities.

The role of disciplinary associations

Substantive expertise is identified with disciplines and the disciplinary associations. These national bodies tend to reflect the production of knowledge and the community of scholars. Although the charter of most disciplinary associations gives a nod to the importance of instruction, active encouragement and support, where it exists, tends to be a special project like an addendum rather than an integral part of the association program. Thus, those who primarily teach do not feel much in common with the disciplinary association. Serving as a practitioner of teaching is primarily compatible with the mandate of the educational institution. Potentially, this creates a dilemma between disciplinary and institutional expectations, particularly if teaching is handled sentimentally rather than as a rational, professional function. A footnote to these subtle issues is the observation that graduate students, entrants into the discipline's orbit, are seen as "our" students, while the undergraduate students in Arts and Sciences are "theirs" (the college's) thus deserving less effort and commitment.

Rewards for teaching

The structural environment of teaching is linked primarily to the institution. Whatever the deficiences of teacher socialization and training may be, the institution provides the tangible norms for criteria of quality teaching, for accountability, and for expectations and rewards. The environment that affects teaching varies significantly among universities, community colleges, and colleges; among rural and urban, private and public, large and small institutions. Yet, in most institutions, one can observe that actual competence as a teacher tends not to be a maior factor in recruitment and hiring practices although the position to be filled is justified by a teaching need. Particularly in universities, new faculty quickly learn that while they were hired for teaching, rewards will come to them for publications and various other non-teaching activities. Certainly promotions and tenure in most universities are based on achievements other then teaching, though lip service is given to the importance of the classroom. Returning to the belief systems described earlier, the belief that teaching is a function of talent militates against a realistic reward system. Since talent is innate and, therefore, not the product of effort, it does not have to be rewarded like scholarship, which is seen as the outgrowth of hard work. "Since we assume that all of our faculty are good teachers, we do not have to consider their teaching in the deliberation of their promotions and advances." This statement, by an academic dean, is much more representative of real perceptions than its extreme language may suggest.

Rewards for teaching are further complicated by the peculiar complexities

in intra-institutional communications. It is a prevalent myth among faculty, particularly at universities, that administrators do not value efforts and achievements in the classroom. Conversely, many administrators, in personal communications, have expressed their frustration with faculty committees that refuse to consider teaching accomplishments in their recommendations for career rewards. Gunnar Myrdal, in his classic study of the *American Negro* points to the power of prevailing norms on the attitudes and behavior of people. As long as recognition and support for teaching is not normatively fashionable, even those committee members who privately feel otherwise are likely to vote for the publication-rich vita and against the teacher because "that is what is expected."

Studying the tribal customs of the college campus sheds light on the real support for conditions leading to quality of instruction. An examination of institutional expenditures and organizational efforts that would compare institutional support for research with support for instruction would yield some interesting indicators of where the real values lie. In a sense, research support expenditures are justified by the unintentional collusion between institutional priorities and idiosyncratic requirements that faculty use in the recruitment-bargaining process. While the design of laboratories and of research instrumentation is continuously subject to innovation and improvement, the teaching environment is rarely the subject of deliberate professional scrutiny and of systematic efforts to relate physical resources to teaching effectiveness. The design and conditions of classrooms in prestigious universities tell the story. The social status of instructional development offices is a fascinating mirror of administration and faculty genuflecting occasionally before an altar that does not dominate the behavior during the weekly campus routine.

Clearly, this picture varies from campus to campus. I have been in college and university settings where resources, architecture, and staffing combined to facilitate the utilization of instructional development and where faculty have grown accustomed to accepting these facilities as an integral part of their teaching plans. I have also been in institutions where even the use of a movie projector requires significant extra effort on the part of the teacher and where classrooms are neither structured for teacher choices of teaching styles nor for the readily accessible use of teaching technology. The availability and, even more so, the ease of access to resources is a much more effective language than sentimental pronouncements and the dramatics of a one-time teacher award.

Evaluating teaching

One more belief-system needs to be identified and the organizational arrangements which derive from it examined for their effect on teaching. Given as a frequent reason for the failure to consider teaching in the review process is the belief that teaching cannot be evaluated. This belief is indeed an inevitable consequence of the beliefs that teaching is a natural talent and a private activity. If, however, teaching is viewed as a professional activity which includes identifiable learned domains of competence and a structural relationship between objectives and expected outcomes, teaching can indeed be evaluated as a purposive process of practices with identifiable criteria of success.

Currently the predominant basis of teacher evaluation is student responses. While such a body of data is indeed important, it casts teaching into the mode of a performance where audience applause is the legitimate index of success. This comment does not obviate the value of student assessment of what the student has learned. The subjective sense of student achievement, if effectively identified, can be a significant index of teacher competence. However, accepting the process

of teaching as a scholarly, professional activity requires the opening of this process to peer scrutiny akin to the process of research. This does not necessarily require classroom visitations for sentencing purposes, although the open classroom can be an important instrument in teacher development and teacher accountability programs. The primary focus of teacher evaluation should be on the teacher's documented plans and resources employed in seeking to achieve the learning objectives with the fullest consideration of relevant factors regarding students, institutional context, subject matter, and an assessment of one's self as an instrument of practice. The course outline, currently primarily a bureaucratic requirement, can become a scholarly document reflecting the teacher's competence and scholarship and simultaneously serving as a contract between teacher and student, teacher and colleagues, and between the teacher and either discipline or college.

The optimal approach to teacher evaluation requires further study and experimentation. The basic issue, however, is that systems of teacher evaluation will be defined as punitive or, at least, extraneous if they do not exist within a context of realistic, collegial, institutional, and academic support for teacher competence and teacher worth. In an environment of recognition of teaching as a practicing, scholarly, and improvable set of skills, teaching assessment, teaching clinics, and teacher development become an integral part of a pervasive climate. In an environment of sharing, rewarding, and supporting teacher development, even classroom visits can be defined as communal rather than administrative.

Projects for change

Commitment to these perceptions of the teacher environment has lead to the design and the strategy of a series of projects sponsored by the American Sociological Association. These projects have been supported by grants from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education and from Lilly Endowment, Inc. Assuming that effective social change must always address several key points in any delicately balanced, complex social system, the ASA Projects on Teaching Undergraduate Sociology planned their program to simultaneously affect the structure of the disciplinary associations on the state, regional, and national levels. The Projects also seek to address institutional environments, including special efforts to assist departmental chairs in using their position as active agents of teaching improvements. In addition, the ASA Projects address many of their programs directly to the teacher. Seeking to improve teacher competence, teacher resources, and a sense of worth and potential power, the ASA Projects conduct workshops, arrange institutional visitations, and provide resources to teachers. We have deliberately sought to affect the symbolic and the real environment from which the teacher selects the cues that suggest the worthiness of efforts and of tasks. If we have succeeded in providing skills and enthusiasm to the individual teacher, we have sought to encourage the use of these advances by stimulating a favorable climate within the institution and a sense of support from the professional association.

The work of the ASA Projects rests on the efforts and enthusiasm of about 100 volunteers who give their time freely. Among them is a smaller group who specialize in visits to colleges and departments. These self-trained resource volunteers have visited more than 50 institutions, including community colleges, colleges, and universities, to conduct workshops, teacher development programs, teaching clinics, and program evaluations. A Teacher Information Exchange is currently being developed providing quick linkages among teachers who share questions about specific issues. The Projects have sponsored scholarly papers and

surveys to enrich the literature about our understanding of the classroom and the teaching process. The ASA Projects have made their services available to other disciplines since the issues addressed are, indeed, common to all phases of undergraduate instruction.

ASA has incorporated into its Executive Office the Teaching Resources Center, which distributes more than 50 items specifically focusing on teaching in general and on teaching of sociology in particular. The Association has voted and published a declaration in support of teaching and in support of deliberate education of teachers. A program of departmental and teacher services has been approved by the ASA Council. The ASA Projects are but an experiment. They seem to have accomplished a noticeable change in the norms of the discipline and in the feeling among teachers, particularly in small and remote collegiate institutions, about the importance of their tasks. Certain important lessons that can be drawn from these experiences can be generalized to other settings, to other disciplines, and to the academic community in general.

Programs to improve teaching that exclusively address the teacher, are not likely to have far-reaching success but rather might increase frustration and a sense of futility. The administrative, disciplinary, and collegial environments of the teacher must be part of the targets of any improvement program. To change behaviors, it is necessary to change the social arrangements that give meaning and values to such behavior and, above all, to change the norms and beliefs that govern what members of the community expect of each other, reward and value in each other, and from which they draw a sense of legitimacy and worth.

NOTES

Current Issues in Higher Education

Copies of the 1979 and 1980 *Current Issues in Higher Education* are available individually or in sets. Bulk discounts available. Order from American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 780, Washington, D.C. 20036; 202/293-6440. Payment must accompany all orders under $15. Orders for three or fewer papers must add $1 handling charge. Ten percent handling charge added to all orders that must be billed.

1980 Series
Complete set $15

1. Improving Teaching and Institutional Quality ($3.50) ■ When Does A College Deserve To Be Called "High Quality"?—Alexander W. Astin ■ Measuring the Quality of Student Effort—C. Robert Pace ■ Commentary on Pace—Mark Curtis ■ The Changing Roles and Priorities of Academic Advising—Toni B. Trombley and David Holmes ■ Teaching Improvement Strategies: How Effective Are They?—Robert J. Menges ■ Are Instructional Improvement Programs Off-Target?—Robert T. Blackburn, Glen Pellino, Alice Boberg, and Colman O'Connell ■ What Are the Obstacles to Improving Quality Teaching?—Hans O. Mauksch

2. Funding Quality Improvement: Lessons from the FIPSE Experience—Charles I. Bunting ■ Commentary on Bunting—Charles Bingman, Sol Pelavin, Kenneth W. Tolo ■ **Proliferation and Agency Effectiveness in Accreditation: An Institutional Bill of Rights**—H. R. Kells ■ Commentary on Kells—Robert L. Ketter, William H. Knisely, Kenneth E. Young ($3.50)

3. Differing Perspectives on Declining Faculty Salaries ($2.50) ■ How Well Are Faculty Paid? Implications of the Academic Reward Structure—Kristine E. Dillon and Robert H. Linnell ■ The Economic Decline of the Professoriate in the 80's: What Happened to Faculty Salaries and What Are the Implications?—Peggy Heim

4. New Models for General Education ($2.50) ■ General Education for a Contemporary Context—Jerry G. Gaff ■ Quality and the Campus: The High School/College Connection—Ernest L. Boyer ■ Curricular Priorities for the 80's: Beyond Retrenchment—John C. Sawhill

5. Integrating Adult Development Theory with Higher Education Practice ($2.50) ■ Adult Development: A Workable Vision for Higher Education—Arthur W. Chickering ■ Faculty and Student Development in the 80's: Renewing the Community of Scholars—L. Lee Knefelkamp

6. Strategies for Retrenchment: National, State, Institutional ($3.50) ■ Basing Public Policy on Student Achievement: A New Agenda Item—Francis Keppel ■ Commentary on Keppel—Willard L. Boyd, Alice J. Irby, Elizabeth H. Johnson, Thurston E. Manning ■ New Roles for the States in Monitoring Higher Education Quality—Carl Kaysen and the Sloan Commission on Government and Higher Education ■ The Management of Universities of Constant or Decreasing Size—Richard M. Cyert

1979 Series
Complete set $12.50

1. Perspectives on Leadership ($2) ■ Changing the Shape of Work: Reform in Academe—Rosabeth Moss Kanter ■ Changing Values: Implications for Major Social Institutions—Morton Darrow ■ Leadership Needs of the 1980's—Michael Maccoby

2. Faculty Career Development ($2.50) ■ The Work Experience of American College Professors: Some Data and an Argument—Everett Carll Ladd, Jr. ■ Adult and Career Development: What Are the Implications for Faculty?—Roger Baldwin ■ Academic Careers and Adult Development: A Nexus for Research—B. Claude Mathis ■ Academic Careers: Patterns and Possibilities—Robert T. Blackburn ■ Engaging Junior Faculty in Career Planning: Alternatives to the Exit Interview—Barbara Lazarus and Martha Tolpin ■ Growth Contracts: Viable Strategy for Institutional Planning Under Changing Conditions—Allan O. Pfnister, Jill Solder, and Nina Verroca

3. Premises of Federal Student Assistance ($1.50) ■ Why Strains on Need-Based Financial Aid Are Increasing and Some Options for Relieving Them—Kenneth M. Deitch ■ How Good Is the Student Financial Aid System?—Martin Kramer ■ Premises of Student Assistance: It Isn't Time for a New Look—Marshall S. Smith

4. Employment Priorities in Academe ($2) ■ Age, Sex, and Ethnic Trade-Offs in Faculty Employment: You Can't Have Your Cake and Eat It Too—Robert H. Linnell ■ You've Come a Long Way, Maybe—Or Why It Still Hurts To Be a Woman in Labor—Bernice Resnick Sandler ■ Can There Be Anything Affirmative About Affirmative Action in the 1980's?—Frank Newman

5. Assessment ($2.50) ■ Defining and Measuring the Competencies of a Liberal Arts Education—David G. Winter ■ Statewide Assessment of Basic Skills—Alice J. Irby ■ Identifying and Evaluating Major Elements in the Quality of Student Life—Thomas R. Plough ■ What Is the Most Effective Way To Handle Program Discontinuance?—Edward A. Dougherty ■ How Do You Know a Good College When You Stumble Over One?—John Harris

6. Tenure ($2) ■ The History of Tenure—Walter P. Metzger ■ The Poverty of Historicism: A Critique of Walter Metzger's Defense of Tenure—James O'Toole ■ The Concept of Tenure and an Alternative—Penina M. Glazer

7. PhDs in Nonacademic Careers: Are There Good Jobs?—Lewis C. Solomon ■ **Robots or Reinsmen: Job Opportunities and Professional Standing for Collegiate Administrators in the 1980's**—Robert A. Scott ($2)